The QUARTERLY JOURNAL *of* SPEECH

VOLUME XXX • DECEMBER, 1944 • NUMBER 4

A GLANCE AHEAD AT THE FIELD OF SPEECH

KARL R. WALLACE
University of Virginia

AS A Constituent Member of the American Council on Education, the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS OF SPEECH sent three official delegates to a meeting sponsored by the American Council in Washington early in May of this year. One of the meetings sought to answer this question: What has civilian education to learn from the educational experiences and techniques of the armed services? Some sixty men representing every academic subject and discipline, liberal and technical, explored this question. Under the leadership of Francis J. Brown of the American Council, the group directed its attention to three matters:

(1) Do the subjects to which the armed forces have given special emphasis—mathematics, physics, chemistry and engineering—have a special value for civilian education after the war? Should colleges give them more emphasis than heretofore, or less?

(2) Since the effectiveness of military education seems to be due in large part to excellent motivation, to what degree and in what ways can colleges and universities better motivate their students?

(3) Should the traditional pace of college education be stepped up? Should colleges make it possible for all students to move along faster and should provision be made at all levels of education and all courses so that the talented students can progress more rapidly than the mediocre?

It is obvious that the answer to these questions and to the questions that they imply are of considerable significance to American education and, in particular, to the field of speech. To consider these matters briefly may prompt us to look ahead, to take stock of what we have been doing in the schools and colleges and whether we can measure up to the needs of the postwar world.

I

The group at the American Council meeting took a practical view of the first question. The discussion can be summarized thus: "Men in the armed services have been trained primarily in mathematics and physics and in the vocations and professions for which these sciences provide a foundation. Soldiers and sailors alike, moreover, see that physics and engineering pay off in actual warfare; technology, in other words, gets results. Furthermore, both the military and civilian stand in wonder and awe at the miracle of American production in supplying materiel and services. Accordingly, after the war students in schools and colleges, including the returning service men, will turn in large numbers to the physical and natural sciences." In other words, the new world will be a technical world, and the humanities—and to some extent the social sciences—will be left on the back seat.

Doubtless there is not yet sufficient evidence to test the correctness of this

in footing the bill for the servicemen's education the government is likely, sooner or later, to set up standards for the product paid for. Of course colleges will deplore Federal control of higher education; already they have insisted that the administration of the educational features of the GI Bill must remain in the hands of the college. Nevertheless, he who pays the fiddler can call the tune; and one needs only to observe how the Smith-Hughes Act affected instruction in agricultural studies to understand the relationship between Federal support of education and Federal control. In fact, much of the "encroachment" of the central government on the functions and "rights" of local and state agencies has come about, by accident or intention, through the pocketbook. Accordingly, English language teachers may be faced with a new Department of Education that eventually will try to determine, directly or indirectly, the kind and amount of instruction in English language, literature, and speech. To whom will it turn—or *should* it turn—for counsel and advice if not to representative groups of English and speech teachers? And at that time what will be the answers of those groups to these questions:

(1) Is there a formula that will keep a Federal agency from virtually dictating the kind and amount of instruction in English and in speech?

(2) If some Federal control is necessary, what are the "standards" of course content and instruction that will not jeopardize freedom of teaching immediately and affect freedom of speech and of the press ultimately?

As individuals and as groups, we must face this prospect with vision and with a positive program; if teachers will not help decide what is to be done and how, then administrators will.

V

at the American Council meeting deal, not with the relative value of particular subjects or groups of subjects to the needs of the post war world, but with pedagogy. The meeting clearly recognized that much of the success of Army training depended upon motivation. The military are training very special skills and most of these are intimately and obviously related to life and death. A former student, now engaged in instructing tail gunners on bombers, said to me, "My teaching presents no real problem. All you've got to do is tell those boys that the average life expectancy in actual combat of a tail gunner is 5 minutes. They work all right, and they learn damn fast." Military education clearly points up the need for greater skill in motivation, especially in the humanities and social sciences, in both school and college. Teachers of speech have never had much trouble in motivating their instruction; our task has been easy as compared to that of the teacher of grammar, literature, mathematics, history, government and foreign languages. Pride, reputation, self-confidence, personal improvement and ultimate professional utility—all these goals most students of speech are keenly aware of, and except in the early days of the required course and in the long training sometimes necessary in the speech clinic, we can get by without giving persistent attention to motivation. But it is precisely because motivation is relatively easy for us that we might greatly improve our teaching at all levels and in all aspects of our subject if we were to re-evaluate our methods and procedures that we employ from course to course and from day to day. Can we, for example, better motivate the study of phonetics, the physics of the voice, the anatomy of the speech mechanism, the methods of argument and persuasive technique, the processes of group discus-

meaning, the intensive study of literature as a preliminary to reading aloud, and the improvement of gesture for the speaker and the actor? Can we improve in developing specific techniques that from the student's point of view are so clear and so *successful* as to carry their own motivation? In brief, how may we better motivate those courses, or parts of courses, that the general student often fails to associate directly with his personal improvement and practical advantage?

VI

The third question raised at the American Council meeting posed two problems: (1) Should colleges retain the accelerated plan of year-round education after the war? (2) Can civilian education provide ways by which a student may get his formal education as fast as his ability warrants? The GI Bill may virtually force most educational institutions to stay on the three-semester basis. Since the Federal government will pay most of the veteran's expenses for eleven months in a college, it seems probable that institutions will run on full-time basis, partly out of a sense of responsibility to the veteran who may be anxious to get special courses or to complete his degree in the shortest possible time so as to speed his return to employment, and partly out of a desire to get their share of federal money. It therefore appears inevitable that we, like all teachers, must further adjust our courses to fit an accelerated pattern for at least five years more, and to adjust our teaching time so that we shall not burn ourselves out.

The second problem has always been with us, and it is doubtful whether we have yet solved it satisfactorily. Have we, in our fundamental courses that touch large groups, made it possible for the student to progress according to his ability? Screening tests, and the classification of students on the basis of them, doubtless have helped tremendously. Nevertheless, there is always within the graded section the individual who ought not to be ignored. What do we do for the boy who after finishing Assignments 1 and 2 is obviously capable of proceeding next to Assignment 4 or 5? Have we adequately worked out schemes satisfactory both to the teacher and to the dean that make every student feel that he can to a large extent set his own pace?

These, then, are the principal problems that seem to press upon teachers of speech. I shall not try to offer solutions, partly because they must reflect the judgment of many, and partly because every teacher ought to have the fun of working out his own solutions!

SPEECH IN THE MILITARY PROGRAM

ARGUS J. TRESIDDER
Lieutenant, USNR, University of Louisville

WHEN the Army Specialized Training Program and the Navy V-12 Program were planned during the winter and spring of 1943, there was general agreement among the educators and officers chosen to work out the details that instruction in speech was to be included in the required basic course. In both programs the intention was to disturb existing curricula as little as possible and to let the individual colleges set up their own courses. That is, general objectives were outlined and certain courses (most of them already established as part of regular engineering, premedical, or liberal arts requirements) were made obligatory. On the whole, both the Army and the Navy hesitated

to dictate academic rules or to prescribe methods or materials. Only in the basic English course did they venture to make a serious change. To the standard study of written composition and literature was added, more or less vaguely, the study of speaking and listening.

Many English departments had long been accustomed to regard speech as a poor relation, to be dealt with by separate departments of speech and drama or by teachers of oratory and elocution, usually held in mild contempt by other English teachers. Some departments, of course, were on cordial terms with speech departments or had allowed speech work to grow honorably within their own boundaries. All had to make immediate adjustment to the new syllabi. For teachers who took seriously the courses as described in the ASTP and V-12 bulletins there was a scramble for speech texts and long conferences with professional speech teachers. Some departments decided to split the work with speech departments. Others, however, decided that since they were not trained teachers of speech they would merely offer lip-service to the prescribed courses and continue to teach English, as they were already certain they knew how to do better than the writers of the bulletins. The results have in some instances been chaotic, more perhaps in the schools with ASTP programs than in those with the Navy program.[1]

II

The objectives for English 111 under the ASTP were described as follows in the original outline of the program:

The end-product of the Army Specialized Training Program is an officer candidate who will, after further specialized training, function effectively in a position of command. He must, therefore:

1. Be a clear thinker.
2. Possess the skill of orderly, concise, and appropriate communication, both oral and written, including the ability to observe and report accurately.
3. Possess the ability to listen and to read understandingly.
4. Know the basic forms of military communication.

In view of the limited time available for instruction in English, it is particularly important that this instruction be reinforced by requiring trainees in all classes to write and speak with deliberation, clearness and correct language. . . .

1. Reading
2. Writing
3. Speaking

Instruction and practice in oral presentation. Development of self-confidence and the ability to think on one's feet. Development of sound habits of brevity, correct pronunciation and enunciation, conciseness of expression, and organization of material. Development of variations in emphasis through correct use of such devices as volume of tone, acceleration and retardation of speed, and the use of the pause. Acquisition of adequate ease and fluency to speak extemporaneously, reasonably free from hesitation, forcefully and pleasingly, and coherently as to sentence and paragraph structure. Elimination of handicaps of speech such as the monotone, undesirable mannerisms and affectations.

Presentations should be so well organized as to impress themselves, in outline on the listeners' memory. They should be subjected frequently to criticism by the hearers in terms of the speaker's appearance, manner, adequacy, brevity, forcefulness, and organization of material.

The first Navy V-12 Bulletin described the basic English course as follows:

The aim of this course is to teach the student to say and write what he means concisely and with a purpose, and to read and listen with precise understanding and discrimination. Problems in oral and written communication; practice in the kinds of expression which students will be called on most often to use—reports of events, summaries of readings and lectures, explanations of problems or situations, Navy letter and report forms, short informal talks, class recita-

[1] In general it is agreed that the Navy plan was more definite, more generous, more far-sighted, and less confusing than the Army plan (which has now been withdrawn from most of the schools in which it was originally established).

tions and discussion. Modern usage—grammar, idiom, sentence structure, punctuation, spelling, organization of material into effective paragraphs and larger units. Readings from periodicals and books, especially of contemporary American writings, to gain information, to extend the student's experience, and to show modern practices in varied types of expression, technical and popular.

Emphasis during the first semester will be on accuracy and conciseness in the handling of informational materials, and during the second semester on judgments and effectiveness in handling materials of considerable complexity and range.

The course will consist of problems in oral and written communication, carried forward co-ordinately under the following heads:

Writing: gathering material; planning and writing various kinds of short papers; reporting of observed events; summaries of short passages; letters and reports (including Navy letter forms and reports); explanation of problems, situations, and processes of increasing complexity.

Speaking: clear and full recitations, short informal talks, giving directions, explaining situations and processes (especially those involving diagrams, models, or specimens), taking part in group discussions, and summarizing talks and discussions as a test of listening.

English usage, oral and written: concise, direct sentences; consecutive and forceful paragraphs; standard practices in pronunciation, punctuation, spelling, idiom, and grammar.

Reading: varied readings in periodicals and books, to gain information, to extend the student's experience, and to show modern practices in common types of technical and popular expression.

The emphasis on the study of spoken as well as written communication is clear. Experts in the training divisions of both the Army and Navy were convinced that officers must be able to talk easily and intelligently to men under their command; that is, that they should have experience under direction in public speaking. They were further convinced that good officers must be free of organic and functional speech defects and able to project their voices clearly and forcefully. Men who must speak over the sounds of battle and the sea cannot afford to have weak or indistinct voices. Men who must discuss plans of action in conferences with fellow officers and serve as teachers (assigning duties, taking charge of drills, demonstrating strategic and tactical principles, explaining the use of equipment, etc.) must not be inarticulate or fuzzy-voiced or lazy-lipped. In times of emergency ideas must be communicated by the living voice, not by the pen.

III

Why have facts as elementary as these, understood by all who planned the college military programs and, presumably, by all who directed the programs in the various colleges and universities, failed to produce really satisfactory results? There are four reasons:

1. Teachers have been inexperienced and, so far as the emphasis on speech is concerned, generally unsympathetic.
2. The courses as described in the two bulletins are too indefinite.
3. On the whole, remedial speech is not provided for.
4. The courses have, in general, been unsupervised.

Let us examine at this point an informal survey among representative English departments in over forty schools where both the ASTP and V-12 programs have been established. The colleges polled were both large and small, in all parts of the country, some with the ASTP course alone, some with the V-12 program alone, some with both. Among them were Columbia, Cornell, Princeton, Duke, Northwestern, DePauw, the Universities of California, Wisconsin, Colorado, North Carolina, and Minnesota, and such colleges as Dartmouth, Swarthmore, Williams, and Colgate.

1. In answer to the question, "Is the course as outlined a wholly satisfactory one?" the replies were about equally

divided between "Yes" and "No."

Some of the reasons given when the answer was "No" were:

"Lack of sufficient class time is basis of practically all difficulties with the course, which is as satisfactory as beginning English courses usually are."

"Although condensation and acceleration are desirable up to a certain point, too much ground was covered for the time available."

"Tries to do a great many things, at least one of which (Naval Correspondence) is probably unnecessary. At same time forces the cancellation of attention once paid to instruction in reading verse and more difficult varieties of prose."

"The description of the course (Navy V-12) seems too crowded. With a section of normal size (25) it is particularly difficult to cover as much ground as is outlined, especially in speech."

"V-12 students came so unprepared that we had to revise our syllabus drastically to include high school training in grammar and other fundamentals."

"If I criticized our course it would be that too much time is given to speech. I believe that freshmen need group discussion under *Robert's Rules of Order* rather than technical speech as a general requirement for all."

"It lacks continuity, since the attention to reading, writing, and speech cannot be completely integrated. The course therefore has three purposes and has to do the work of three courses. In the case of Engineering students, the rest of their required program is so exclusively technical that it is difficult for them to develop much interest in English or devote much attention to it."

"We consider the Navy V-12 the more successful program, partly because it put less emphasis on oral work, partly because we found the two semesters better than three 12-week terms. The Navy provided for more time in class and more study outside."

"The Army expected us to do too much in too short a time. Such specifications as were given us were flatly contradicted by the examination in English which the Army gave at the end of each term."

"This course compares satisfactorily with the traditional courses in written and oral composition. Its limitations are inherent in any short-term effort to do for a student what he has been unable to do for himself during the previous eighteen or nineteen years of his life."

2. Few heads of departments were willing to admit that their instructors were able to do justice to instruction in speech. Several admitted that their courses had no formal work in speech. About a quarter of those answering said that part of the work was done by speech teachers.

3. Except in four schools where no formal work in speech was given, the time devoted to speech varied from one-sixth to one-half. The usual ratio was one day in three. Some concentrated the work: one school gave two and one-half to three weeks in each semester; another spent an entire term of twenty-four class hours on speech alone.

4. In five schools a remedial speech specialist or clinic was available. Most of the others did nothing with remedial speech. One department head said that it was not needed for service men.

5. Curiously enough, most of the chairmen felt that students profited from their experience in speaking, though some qualified their answers by such statements as "Yes, though they perhaps needed more the exactness that comes of writing," and "Yes, as far as it goes," and "Some do, some don't."

6. Somewhat inconsistently, the majority of the department heads declared that their teachers like the blending of oral and written composition, though some came out with flat-footed denials.

7. Seven of the schools had courses combining oral and written composition already established. To the question, "Will you recommend a course in oral and written composition after the military program is withdrawn," the majority of the chairmen said "No." Only four admitted that they would so recommend.

8. Military authorities exercised almost no supervision of the courses on any of the campuses. In most colleges, according

to the heads of the English departments, the military authorities were not even interested in the courses or had only "superficial interest."

Some comments by the English teachers may throw further light on success or lack of success of the programs:

"We have not cut down on oral work partly because we feel that the men need this oral training very much, and partly because the men have enjoyed this part of the program and have shown real improvement as the result of the training we have given them. But doing work in speech has cut into our program more than we had anticipated—it takes a long time to get around a class for only three minute speeches. We have followed the policy of having the men criticized immediately both by the instructor and by their classmates."

"By and large, we are grateful for the liberality of the Navy's ideas on what constitutes desirable speech and writing achievement for a Naval officer. For the most part, the students are interested and willing, though many of them have been out of contact with their English training so long that they require considerable currying; a few of them are illiterate."

"The Commanding Officer desired an emphasis of speech without lessening the emphasis of fundamentals. As a result we organized our present plan with composition and literature teachers teaching one day a week and coordination affected by the teachers teaching the same sections. In a few cases, we had teachers with expert training in both composition and speech. This was the ideal situation. There is no question that the course ought to be five credits instead of three, but, with this qualification, the teachers, the Navy, and the department have prized the course."

"A freer course in literature, involving some writing and speech (instead of a formal discipline) would better serve the ends of the Navy in preparing officers."

"The small amount of extempore speaking that we have been able to include in the Navy course has proved to be useful and may be continued in the regular composition course."

"We like the oral approach, even when the main interest is in written composition. We like the analytical approach, also, and find that these can usually be combined."

"We had such a course before the Navy came, but in the future our civilian course will probably emphasize speech more than in the past."

"Our course . . . keeps writing as the first objective and speaking secondary. There is obviously not enough time to do both thoroughly. As with all composition courses success is more a matter of able teaching personnel than of details of procedure."

"Our experience is that the speech-composition-combination is a worth-while innovation and that standard freshmen courses throughout the country should recognize the fact that speech and writing are so closely related that they should both be emphasized in the elementary courses. We do not feel that greater emphasis on oral work in the freshman composition class in any way takes the place of some instruction given by an expert. . . . About all we can hope to accomplish in oral work at the freshman level is to enable the student to overcome stage fright and to gain reasonable assurance in addressing his classmates."

Summary of Survey: Though many teachers realize that the combination of written and oral composition is of value to students, they are in the main opposed to courses in which the two aspects of communication are taught together. In the interpretation of the plan of courses in English there is wide disagreement. Several chairmen referred to an article on the ASTP which appeared in the April, 1944, issue of *Harper's Magazine*. They were undoubtedly in agreement with the author's statement:

> Some of the improvements were doubtful, at least for their intended purpose. A case in point was the English course, which was originally planned by its authors as a simple course in direct communication, and later emerged as a much broader and more loosely knit course, subject to widely varied interpretation. This course rapidly got out of hand, with some colleges teaching English literature, some American literature, and some both, and with powerful speech departments in some universities demanding half of the course time to teach public speaking.[2]

[2] Robert G. Hawley, "The Army Quits the Colleges," p. 422.

The planners of the programs did not make fully clear whether they intended the English courses to be taught by both the speech and English departments. Many of the answering schools have divided courses; most use only the English teachers.

Most teachers, even those approving the courses, believe that too little time is allowed to achieve the aims. But the greatest difficulty seems to be in deciding exactly what the aims are and what subject-matter should be included. *Only a very few English teachers admit that the old freshman composition courses should be scrapped and a new one built and that in the freshman year there is little place for the study of literature. A similar survey among teachers of speech (a fairly impracticable attempt in a course dominated by English departments) would certainly reveal less conservative opinions and more revolutionary suggestions.*

IV

Now let us return to the four reasons given earlier as the major flaws in the basic English course.

1. Few teachers of English are prepared to give adequate instruction in speech. The contrary is also true: few teachers of speech can cope with the intricate problems of English composition as most departments believe it must be taught. Except in the grade schools and high schools, teachers of English are inclined to be indifferent if not hostile to oral expression. Many of them feel that they have little enough time to attend properly to syntax, punctuation, and composition. They resent, even if only passively, the necessity of devoting as much as a third of the basic course to speech. They would probably admit individually (though their department heads think otherwise) that they know very little about the techniques of speaking and nothing at all about voices. Another reason some of them frankly admit is that they are not interested in public speaking and they do not like to teach it.

Some colleges have for some time been experimenting with a course in which oral and written composition are blended. They have made a sincere attempt to restore the classical concept of rhetoric, which admitted no artificial divorce of the principles of speaking and the principles of writing. This course in Communication, which anticipated the basic course as set up by the planners of the military programs, was making excellent headway. The colleges which had tried the combined work had little difficulty in adjusting their work to the requirements for V-12 and ASTP trainees.

In many other colleges, however, the new course has not been favorably received. Some teachers have either ignored speech entirely or perfunctorily assigned occasional oral reports that were criticized only as themes. Others who have honestly tried to incorporate speech into the course have continued on the assumption that the basic principles of the two subjects cannot be reconciled. They have been dissatisfied with their work because they cannot cover all they think necessary for a thorough knowledge of formal English and they see only superficial improvement in their students' speaking habits.

2. The courses as described in the bulletins are not sufficiently definite to give teachers of English, whose ideas on the subject of speech are likely to be vague, a clear understanding of objectives and standards.

The military authorities themselves are not sure of their interpretation of the emphasis on speech. The director of the

Army Specialized Training Division, Colonel Herman Beukema, in a letter to ASTP units (October 11, 1943) declared that "very little formal speech instruction will be necessary." He was not pleased that some institutions were devoting as much as a third of the basic English course to formal instruction in speech. He believed that all participation in class discussions is to be regarded as exercise in speech. "It is imperative that soldiers be able to make themselves understood," he said, "but they need not be speech-makers."

In a recent article in the QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH (February, 1944), Professor Earl Wiley, of Ohio State University, answers Colonel Beukema's arguments:

> If "formal speech instruction" means the competent conducting of speech classes that has been done for many years by competent speech teachers, then qualified educators will question Colonel Beukema's position. Certainly, devoting one-third of the time in English 111 to speech problems is none too much *if its course objectives are to be realized.*

Professor Wiley has answered the question only for the schools that have cooperating speech teachers. In the many schools where English teachers are struggling with the whole course (and this is true even in some of the schools where speech teachers take over a portion of the work, for by and large there are not enough speech instructors to go around), it is apparent that they must learn more about the teaching of speech than some of them are willing to do.

3. The planners of the English course make no mention of speech correction. It is apparently enough if students get opportunities to address their classmates. Since the teacher is not expected to know anything about voice and diction, speech defects must pass unnoticed, untreated, or both. Without trained speech teachers, of course, this omission is inevitable. It is, however, a real weakness in the course unless clinical facilities are available to which the inexperienced English teachers can send students with vocal difficulties. That such attention is necessary is indicated by a recent clinical test at the University of Illinois given to advanced ROTC cadets with special emphasis on speech for military purposes. Of 672 cadets tested 292 or 42.8% were judged to have one or more speech defects that would hinder their military efficiency. A total of 590 speech defects were found among the 292 speech defective cadets, or an average of 2 defects per cadet.[3]

4. One of the faults of the Army and Navy programs is that few checks are made on the effectiveness of the courses offered. The military authorities prefer to interfere as little as possible with the academic departments. This democratic forbearance, though it keeps academic freedom intact, allows evils to exist. Poor teaching goes undetected. No one is the wiser if a teacher of English unobtrusively slips back into the conventional course and deliberately ignores oral communication.

V

These, then, are some of the defects of the basic course. How can they be corrected?

1. There is little doubt that satisfactory teaching of speech cannot be produced by patchwork short courses or by "refresher" courses. Teachers of English are generally unsuited to the task of dealing with speech problems. Nevertheless, in those schools whose basic course is taught entirely by English teachers, some training, even though inadequate, is necessary. They should be required to take a

[3] Nelson, McKelvey, Hunter, Walter, "An Experimental Military Speech Correction Program," QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH, XXX (February, 1944), 11-12.

course in speech, conducted by an experienced teacher who will stress the elementary problems that will be met in the basic course. This refresher course should include speech composition along with delivery, and some time should be devoted to the vocal elements of tempo, pitch, quality, and volume, as well as to enunciation and pronunciation. Simple functional speech defects should be described and, if no clinic is available, corrective procedures indicated. Certainly a few of the standard books on speech composition, delivery, voice and diction, and correction should be placed in the departmental libraries.

2. The descriptions of the courses in the V-12 bulletin (and in the surviving and newly developing units of ASTRP) can be made more definite. There should be no doubt in the mind of the teacher on what he is expected to do, how much time is to be spent in speech training, and what, exactly, he is trying to accomplish. The course plan should include such objectives as special types of speeches (expository, argumentative, entertaining), criteria for the judging of talks, and a suggested set of assignments, observing the ratio of 2 to 1, two periods of writing to one of speaking.

3. If possible, a speech expert should be made available for consultation with both teachers and trainees. Ideally, each student should be given a clinical test, and those needing treatment required to visit the clinic at regular intervals.

4. An expert appointed by the Navy (or Army) should visit each unit to see that the English course is properly administered. He could consult with the teachers on his periodic visits and offer advice based on his observations. If the services of such an expert were to be resented as intrusive or paternalistic, the head of the department in collaboration with the military authorities in the unit might make himself responsible for supervision of his teachers.

VI

It may be said that this entire discussion is now beside the point, or practically so, because the original Army program is closed out, and the Navy last month began the reduction of its program.

We hold to a different view. *At this writing three separate bills are pending in Congress for postwar compulsory military training, and one of them calls for a war mobilization program that includes women. Should any such postwar compulsory training be adopted it will sooner or later, in some way, become related to higher education. Again there will be a confused college "English" course prescribed by military authorities and taught by colleges under contract. This time we shall have such contract courses, not for a few war years, but for many years to come.*

Now, in the interval between the near-end of teaching contract war courses and the possible beginning of teaching contract postwar courses, is the time to appraise and improve. If we wait until the postwar directives are drawn up, again it will be too late either for effective appraisal or for improvement.

SPEECH FOR AMERICANS

LOU LABRANT
New York University

FOR want of a nail the shoe was lost; for want of a shoe . . .", and so on goes the tale till the battle is lost for want of a horse-shoe nail. The old story is but another way of saying that no detail is insignificant and all parts of a whole are essential. Despite our willingness to admit this, we go on in our schools teaching by bits, each one lost in his own little area, not realizing the wider meanings of the things we do each day. Thus we have teachers of English meeting as one department, librarians in another, and teachers of speech in a third despite the fact that all three are concerned primarily with that most significant phase of human behavior—language.

I

The foregoing is, of course, just the beginning of the story. Teachers of speech and of English may work happily together, but be unaware of the larger aims of the school, community, or nation in so far as their assignments and procedures go. Most serious, perhaps, of all, they may not realize the potency of the materials with which they deal.

We are living in a society whose very perseverance is in question. Can the democratic ideal survive? can it become a reality? Answers to such questions depend in large part on the ability of individual citizens to understand each other, to talk over their common aims and dangers, and to develop plans better than the plan of any one man. Through face-to-face speech, radio broadcasts, moving picture plays and sketches, printed materials, and dramatic presentations, we must learn and exchange learning. Therefore of primary importance is our way of using language, the tool which more than any other makes us human. With this vital and intimate behavior teachers of speech and teachers of English (granting for the moment that there *is* a distinction) have elected to deal. What must be our first—our basic—considerations?

It is one of our shortcomings as teachers that we are often satisfied by procedures, materials, or techniques which we find to be "good." The children like this or that; we succeed in getting them to read something which we think is an important or beautiful piece; we secure from them a piece of writing or a bit of speaking which is interesting or charming or sharp or original; we train them to act a play which pleases the public or entertains the school; we change an accent from this to that; we eliminate "he done" and substitute "he did." All these we call "good" and are at peace with our souls. This is not sufficient. Much more is at stake, and we are responsible for more than we would perhaps like to admit. For the gains we make, the "goods" we produce, are always at the expense of other possible gains. Stevenson writes pleasantly on the advantages of idling; Thoreau goes to the woods to think; Edison works eighteen hours a day in his laboratory; another finds great satisfaction in cutting wood or planting grain. Some of us might follow Stevenson at the expense of the comfort and even the lives of others. Peace as opposed to war is a good; but Patrick Henry found it not good "at the price of chains and slavery." Teachers, like other men, are never free from the necessity for making choices among values, good or better, immediate or remote, individual or social, pleasant or pressing. Every teacher has constantly

to think these out for himself, in terms of what he holds as highest. I present the following because they seem to me unavoidable responsibilities, in that sense "best" aims.

II

First, I believe *every citizen who comes from our schools, elementary, high school, or college, should have sufficient confidence in his own word to speak it freely.* This does not mean that we should have reckless talking; quite the opposite. From the day the child enters school, however, he should be helped to feel that what he honestly thinks and what he finds to be true is worthy of a hearing. Repeatedly we hear persons say: "Oh, I know I had an idea; but so many others talk better than I do that I kept still." The emphasis has been put upon the manner, rather than the content of the contribution. Both speech and English teachers have a clear responsibility to discover when—at what point for each child—the emphasis on correctness of word selection or of pronunciation or enunciation overshadows the importance of presenting an idea. Form, whether in speech or writing, is a means to an end. Correct enunciation is unimportant to the person who does not talk. True, good speech often gives confidence and encourages expression. The point I am trying to make is that the teacher must study the child to discover when that is true. All too frequently children from foreign-language homes become ashamed, embarrassed, silent. They tend to group together, to become an alien community. Speech training that does not bring the child with a dialect closer to the majority is defeating its own end. A teacher's effort to help the child speak well may, unless carefully made, leave him less rather than more at ease.

Similar care is necessary in the correction of grammatical errors. A student in my class recently came in for a conference. I discovered that he had a rich understanding of problems with which the class had been concerned. "Why," I asked, "have you not come into the discussion? You know more on this point than any other person in the whole group." He hesitated and then said: "I've never talked well." He had a noticeable accent, but a rather charming one. Inquiry disclosed that he had been corrected repeatedly for pronunciation and incorrect phrases, at an age when he felt only shame, shame which included his parents as well as himself. He had not wanted to have his mother or father at the school. Their speech was "worse" than his.

Frequently in our desire to have all our students achieve conventional speech, we make a similar error with teaching usage. The extent to which we correct a child's word selection, pronunciation, or manner of talking in general should depend upon the probability that our correction will promote and not check free discussion. If his errors are serious it is doubtful whether wholesale correction will have the salutary effect. Even we, presumably expert, adults, are limited in the degree to which we can permit anyone to correct or question our speech without our developing resentment, fears, or reticence. Rapport between student and teacher is imperative if we are to have wholesome results.

III

A second imperative is that the student should feel responsibility for what he says; and as a correlate, responsibility to say what he has that can inform or help others. An important phase of speech development, one for which the school must take major responsibility, is speaking before a group, either formally or informally. Patently, this complex of

skills grows with practice. Herein, however, lies a danger, for we sometimes sacrifice sincerity for frequency. The assignment then calls merely for making outlines, using correct usage, pronunciation, and posture, securing attention, and talking a given time. These are important matters if used as means to sincere communication. The comment that "this is only for class, not what I believe" indicates a false attitude toward the spoken word. Means are mistaken for ends, and a not impossible corrolary is to conclude that a speaker is to be judged by his words as such, and not by a critical consideration of his purpose and meaning. As adults we are sometimes influenced by just such false values. Young Americans should have many ideas and experiences worth telling to their classmates. Unimportant, irresponsible talks are practice in unsound use of language.

On the other hand, the class engaged in true discussion or in a real exchange of ideas has the basic material for evaluating speech. Desiring to convey an idea, the student finds a motive for speech improvement and correction—one which puts the focus on his intent. This is doubtless a point made repeatedly by speech teachers and it would not be repeated here were it not also true that the principle is being violated daily in many classes where students are learning to speak and write. "Tell me something to talk about; I have to make a talk in class," can be heard in many a student group. In a world where high-school students are within sight of the most critical responsibilities any citizenry has undertaken, we find students talking "to be talking," making so-called "speeches" in which they have no stakes, no vital interests. These are not imaginary cases, nor rare ones. Thousands of youngsters are being encouraged to do this pointless, purposeless talking. Nor is it sufficient for the teacher of speech or English to place the blame on the shoulders of those who teach history or civics or science or something else; the responsibility lies in the school and every teacher is a part of the school.

Discussion during the next 25 years will doubtless call for a very high degree of thought and skill in the use of words. World problems are more confusing than village difficulties, if only by the fact that they are more numerous. Experience in discussing—not great world problems—but problems important to students is a major step toward adult responsibility. Speech teachers are in a strategic position for drawing out from their pupils the experiences, ideas, and emotions basic to understanding of each other. It is at least possible that in some classes labeled "history," "literature," or "sociology" the student may fear to contradict established points of view, seeming thereby to expose ignorance which is related to his mark in the course. In a situation where emphasis is on clarity and sincerity of expression, the emphasis of a teacher's point of view or the slant of a given textbook is less influential. The speech class offers almost unparalleled opportunity for discussion.

IV

Related to the above is the school debate. Some aspects need mention, although in the larger number of schools the so-called debate has given way to informal discussions, exchange of information, no-decision arguments, panels, and similar forms. Since by its very nature a debate implies an undecided question, the outcome may well be measured by the growth of understanding rather than by the fixing of opinions. The old-time debate in which one debator or one group of debators attempted to maintain a point regardless of opposing evidence pointed toward prejudice rather than intelligent solution of problems. Unless an

argument has only one side, in which case it is a waste of time, each debator should learn from the others. An important element in learning from discussion is acceptance and use of new evidence as it appears, in further exploration of a question.

Sometimes debate groups are even set to debate from first negative and then positive angles, apparently a sure guarantee that in neither event will they be saying what they believe. Skill in manipulating words is a dubious kind of learning in a civilized country. We have recently seen havoc wrought by this kind of behavior.

Teachers often hesitate to permit discussion of controversial issues because of the animosities aroused. This seems to me an evasion of the hard part of the teaching. The language—speech if you will—problem is to learn how to discuss critical matters. If no one is concerned about the issue, little skill is required for its consideration. We are all in need of learning why it is that so frequently we arouse only anger when we sincerely desire to learn. Surely our most controversial problems are the ones we need desperately to talk out. How to do this is a matter which can be taught and learned. An important discussion of such techniques is found in Hayakawa's little book, *Language in Action,* or in Lee's *Language in Human Affairs.*

V

A third imperative comes in part from the nature of our population and our national concepts, and in part from the world which seems to be coming up to meet us. Perhaps eventually dialects, primitive languages, and broken speech will disappear; some persons believe that some day all mankind will speak one tongue. Apparently, however, our neighborhood will expand physically some time before we unify it socially or linguistically. A bar to pleasant adaptability to this new world, in which a trip to Siam substitutes the trip our parents once took to the county seat, is found in our attitude toward language differences. Many hear a new language, or a variant, as queer or inferior. *It is important for our children to understand quickly that differences are merely differences. They may prefer a certain language or dialect, but they should be able to adapt to others just as they adapt to different architectures.* Before the next half century ends, many now in our schools will have heard scores of languages, dialects, and accents, and may themselves be speaking languages they now think of as remote. Teachers of speech have a great opportunity to make students less provincial, more sophisticated about language. The teachers of foreign language have a part to play here; but the teacher of speech has perhaps a greater field. A class studying dialects can at the moment offer a rich introduction to language variety without losing any of the values now attained. Perhaps this is only another aspect of the basic principle that an individual should always respect the language of another person.

Respect for others includes recognition of the fact that it is "right," "good," for the foreign-born parent, or the older, less well educated person to speak in his way, without loss of dignity; for differences in phraseology to exist between city and country man, between scholarly and unscholarly. Nevertheless they can speak comfortably to each other. Language should be taught not as a mark of class, but rather as an appropriate way for the person to behave.

From childhood on, language must be used and regarded as a means to the end of communication, not as a mark of distinction or a bar to understanding. "I did" is preferable to "I done"; but "I done" is preferable to embarrassed si-

lence. Occasionally we hear the argument that with such an attitude our students will be careless of their speech, accepting anything that can be understood. This is using "understood" in a very limited sense, and restricting conversation to trivial affairs. Respect for meaning, recognition of approved form and generally accepted diction as helpful means, and consideration and appreciation of the differences among people will result in respect for and pride in the best the young boy or girl can himself do. It is not the world traveler who is amused by or scornful of a different tongue; it is the provincial. Respecting a different culture or form of behavior does not necessarily lead one to copy it. Blind learning is the least fruitful and lasting.

Such speech education as I have considered affects the whole school curriculum, and requires the help of all teachers. That is more than we can expect, at least today. The teacher of speech and the teacher of English have accepted the special role of experts in language; they must also carry large responsibility for its use, larger responsibility than they may care to take. Every teacher has to do more than the letter requires. In a nation like ours, a democracy in a world society, this responsibility for use of, and attitudes toward language is very heavy indeed.

POSTWAR COMMUNICATIONS AND SPEECH EDUCATION

PAUL A. WALKER AND WALTER B. EMERY
Federal Communications Commission

RECENT developments in the field of communications should be of real interest to teachers of speech. Although much of the recent technical progress cannot yet be revealed, it can be said that vastly improved techniques of communication will follow the war. It would seem wise for educators in the speech field to begin planning at once to make full and effective use of these new techniques.

I

To begin with, frequency modulation broadcasting, popularly known as FM, is likely to see a rapid growth. The effectiveness of this new radio medium has been clearly demonstrated. This is evidenced by the fact that as of September 1 of this year, more than 50 such stations were licensed to operate and more than 225 applications for new ones had been filed with the Federal Communications Commission.

According to engineers FM is superior for broadcasting on frequencies above 25,000 kilocycles. Because atmospheric and electrical noises consist primarily of amplitude variations, standard radio, technically known as amplitude modulation, often is afflicted with static. With standard radio, we cannot always be sure that we will get an accurate reproduction of the speaker's voice in the distant radio station. Extraneous noises produced by electrical devices, such as motors, elevators, industrial machinery, or atmospheric phenomena, often get into the receiving set. These competing stimuli mar the vocal quality and may ruin reception.

Frequency modulation, on the other hand, has an inherent advantage in avoiding these noises. Even though a storm may be raging, attended by frequent bursts of thunder and flashes of lightning, or though an electric train may be roaring past our door, still the reception remains clear. The program

comes in so well that it is almost like being in the studio where it is produced. In FM transmission, no alien noises detract from the quality of speech or upset the balance of musical tone.

Another advantage for FM over standard broadcasting is that stations may be operated much closer together on the same channel without objectionable interference. This means that many more stations soon may be operating and providing local radio service. For speech teachers this has important implications. Speech and drama departments now provide many of the programs broadcast by educational radio stations. Some of the larger universities and colleges have well-rounded radio courses and supply talent to the stations operated by those institutions. Public schools, such as those in Cleveland, have their own radio stations and are providing excellent speech training in the radio field. With many new opportunities for broadcasting made available, there is no good reason why institutions of higher learning, as well as the public schools, in every part of the country should not have FM stations. This means that a greater number of speech students throughout the country will get the benefit of radio experience. It should give impetus to the introduction of new radio courses, and to the development of new schools of radio.

The FCC already has reserved five channels for educational FM broadcasting, and has sought to encourage schools to make fuller use of these frequencies. On July 18 of this year, the FCC announced its willingness to give careful consideration to proposed statewide plans for the use of these educational frequencies. It was stated that "such plans, if carefully prepared with a view to fair treatment of public and private educational institutions, both urban and rural, at the primary, secondary, higher and adult education levels alike, may provide a sound means for securing the maximum possible utilization of educational frequencies. Accordingly, while the Commission must dispose of each application on its merits, it will give careful consideration in connection with educational applications to any state-wide plan filed with it." The Commission has given and will continue to give encouragement to education on all levels as regards the use of these channels.

Another fact that should interest speech instructors is that FM, possessing high fidelity, is ideal for group listening. Students and teachers in the fields of public address, phonetics, dramatics, etc., may receive clearly during class periods the broadcasts of important speeches, round table discussions, debates, or plays. Imagine the satisfaction that would come to a class in drama listening to the broadcast of a play over an FM station. Every part, every subtle vocal variation and tonal quality, would be heard with almost perfect clarity.

In view of the fact that FM stations can be constructed so economically, it is not inconceivable that some large speech departments and schools of speech and drama may have their own stations. It has been estimated that an FM transmitter may be purchased for the cost of one small school building. Some speech departments have invested as much or more in the construction of theatres. At least there are possibilities here which should stimulate the thinking of speech educators.

II

Add to FM the use of television, and the possibilities for communications in the educational field are almost unlimited. It is not meant to suggest that in the immediate future schools over the country will be operating television stations. However, if the problem of cost can be overcome, there is no valid reason why educational institutions should not even-

tually make use of this modern mercury. Reports show that remarkable progress in the science of television has been made in recent years. Excellent pictures, including colored ones, are now being transmitted. Once the curtain of war has fallen, television is likely to advance rapidly, and within a few years we are likely to have many television stations and even networks.

Industry sees the great possibilities of this new communication medium and is making plans for expansion. For example, recently the FCC approved conditional grants for the American Telephone and Telegraph Company to construct two experimental radio stations that are to be used as terminal points for a proposed wide-band, point-to-point radio repeater circuit capable of relaying television, facsimile, and other forms of communication. The Commission authorized the company to use 12 bands of ultra-high frequencies for these experimental purposes. Other industries and agencies, likewise, are experimenting in the video field.

Television production is one of the most difficult of all the communication arts. As it develops, the demand for capable talent will increase. It will follow that speech and dramatic departments may very well play an important part in this training of students for the television field.

Envisioning the possibilities of using television in the American schools of tomorrow, we shall see important events brought to the classroom, dormitory, and fraternity. The reproduction of actual classroom situations, with pictures of teachers and students participating, will be brought to homes throughout the community. Mothers and fathers living fifty miles away may see, as well as hear, their children give performances in school plays, or give speeches in the classroom. Students will see, as well as hear, outstanding speakers throughout the world. Imagine the impetus that will be given to educational broadcasting such as junior and senior town meeting programs, and round-table discussions such as the University of Chicago Round Table. The pictures of participants as well as audience situations may be transmitted for the enlightenment and entertainment of students in all parts of the country. In fact, every important phase of life can be brought to the classroom and correlated with the instructional program.

Standard AM broadcasting no doubt will continue to play its role in the postwar world, since FM stations are not able to achieve the long distance coverage of our present high-powered clear-channel stations. Likely there will be a continued demand for these, especially in rural areas and in sections with small communities that are widely separated. Many standard stations are likely to continue operations, and manufacturers are likely to provide receiving sets capable of receiving both standard and FM broadcasts.

III

In March, 1940, the Federal Communications Commission held extensive hearings on the subject of frequency modulation. Prominent educators requested that definite assignments be made to education for this new type of broadcasting. As a result, the FCC reserved five channels for educational institutions.

As of September 15, 1944, one institution of higher learning, the University of Illinois, was operating an FM station, and construction permits had been granted to the state universities of Iowa and Kentucky, and to the University of Southern California. As of the same date, public school systems in Chicago, New York, San Francisco, and Cleveland were

operating FM stations, and a construction permit had been granted to the public schools of Buffalo. In view of the fact that applications for commercial stations are being filed at a rapid rate, it is imperative that educational institutions move fast if the channels set aside for them are to be reserved. It is obvious that frequencies should not be allowed to go to waste. If educational institutions do not see fit to take full advantage of their opportunities in the FM field, then it may become necessary to allocate frequencies to other applicants.

The U. S. Office of Education has been providing information on the possibilities of FM and is urging schools to take advantage of these new facilities. The FCC recently adopted a new and simplified application form for schools wishing to apply for FM stations. Already more than 40 schools have filed applications, and the fact that many application forms are being requested indicates increased interest in the educational field. Realizing how effectively radio may implement courses and extracurricular activities in speech, instructors should, whenever possible, impress upon school authorities the possibilities of FM and urge that they get ready for this new medium of communication.

Once critical materials are available for civilian uses, a tremendous expansion in FM, television, and possibly facsimile will take place. When this time comes, speech educators should be ready to make effective use of these new facilities. It is time now to begin making plans.

THE LANGUAGE PROBLEMS OF GERMAN-SPEAKING REFUGEES AND ENGLISH-SPEAKING INVADERS

C. M. WISE, *Louisiana State University*
AND
MORRIS COHEN, *Hollywood, California*

THE United States has been the land of opportunity for German-speaking immigrants for many generations. Even after the establishment of the quota system through the legislation of 1917, 1921, and 1924, immigration continued up to the quota limit. Recently it has taken a new form, refugee immigration. In this fashion, German-speaking men and women from Austria, Czechoslovakia, Poland, and strangely enough, Switzerland, including both Germans of anti-Nazi opinion and German-speaking Jews, have sought asylum here. Of late we hear of plans for granting temporary sanctuary to even larger numbers of refugees.

The language problem of these refugee people, i.e., their need to be able to use highly perfected English, is a much more serious one than that of most of the earlier immigrants. The earlier German-speaking newcomers were largely peasants, artisans and tradesmen, who sought nothing so earnestly as good farms, remunerative work or business openings. They managed passably on picked-up English, which they seldom perfected by formal academic effort, either in grammar or pronunciation. Modern refugee immigrants, on the other hand, are oftener than not educated persons, to whom English grammar is an old story. But their conversational fluency is likely to be faulty, and their German accent heavy. To continue their lives as college professors, physicians or what not, they definitely need to improve their pronunciation. The intent of much of the following material is to illuminate the

problems of such people, and equally, of those who undertake to teach them better English.

As a very different part of the present world situation, the English-speaking invaders of Germany, both during the period of seizure of the country and during the probably longer period of military occupation, will need to use the best German possible. Their communication with the German people will thereby be more accurate and effective, and the respect and friendship which they will hope to win will come the more easily. Accordingly, a portion of this discussion is devoted to assisting speakers of English to achieve better German pronunciation.

For the achievement of either of these ends, it is necessary for the teacher, and ultimately for the student, to understand the sound systems of both languages, first in respect to their resemblances, then their gross differences, and finally, so far as possible, the nuances of detailed difference. A good beginning may be made by setting the two sound systems beside each other, as they appear below, to facilitate comparison. Here corresponding sounds are paired, leaving gross as well as detailed differences to be discussed later. Obviously, considering space limits of this discussion, it is necessary to presuppose an elementary knowledge of both languages on the part of any reader, as well as familiarity with the International Phonetic Alphabet. The problems of the German learner of English will be taken up first.

I—Teaching English to Speakers of German

Gross Resemblances and Differences among English and German Sounds

The German and English Sound Systems
(Corresponding Sounds Paired)

CONSONANTS

	German	*English*
Plosive	p *Puppe* [pupə]	p *pail* [peɪl]
	b *Buch* [bux]	b *book* [buk]
	t *Tafel* [tɑfəl]	t *table* [teɪbəl]
	d *Dach* [dɑx]	d *do* [du]
	k *kann* [kɑn]	k *can* [kæn]
	g *Gold* [gɔlt]	g *gold* [gould]
	ʔ vereinigt [fɛɐ̯ʔaɪnɪçt]	ʔ (Appears only occasionally, as a member of the t-phoneme—cf. *sentence* [sɛnʔənts]—or as a separator of adjacent vowels—cf. *the evil one* [ðɪʔivəl wʌn])
Nasal	m *mein* [maɪn][1]	m *mine* [maɪn]
	n *nein* [naɪn]	n *nine* [naɪn]
	ŋ *singen* [zɪŋən]	ŋ *sing* [sɪŋ]

[1] Note below that the diphthong is rendered in several ways in different dialects.

Lateral	l *legen* [legən]	l *lay* [leɪ]
Trilled	ř *rot* [řot][2]	
		ɾ *very*, alternate E. form [vɛɾɪ]
	ʀ, ʁ *rot* [ʀot, ʁot]	
Fricative		ɹ *dry* [dɹaɪ]
	Φ *Pferd*, dial. [Φɛřt][2]	
	β *Gabel*, dial. [gɑβəl]	
	f *finden* [fɪndən]	f *find* [faɪnd]
	v *wissen* [vɪsən]	v *valley* [vælɪ]
		θ *thing* [θɪŋ]
		ð *this* [ðɪs]
	s *das* [dɑs]	s *so* [sou]
	z *Rose* [řozə]	z *rose* [rouz]
	ʃ *Schade* [ʃɑdə]	ʃ *shame* [ʃeɪm]
		ʒ *rouge* [ruʒ]
	ç *ich* [ɪç]	ç (only as a member of the h-phoneme—cf. *huge* [çudʒ])
	x *ach* [ɑx]	
	ɣ *Wagen*, dial. [βɑɣən]	
	h *haben* [hɑbən]	h *have* [hæv]
		ʍ *which* [ʍɪtʃ]
Frictionless		w *witch* [wɪtʃ]
	ʋ *Schwein* [ʃʋaɪn]	
		r *rain* [reɪn]
	j *ja* [jɑ]	j *yes* [jɛs]
Affricate	pf *Pferd* [pfɛřt][2]	
	tʃ *Putsch* [pʊtʃ]	tʃ *clutch* [klʌtʃ]
		dʒ *Joe* [dʒou]
	ts *Zeit* [tsaɪt]	ts *puts* [pʊts]

VOWELS

i *wie* [vi]	i *week* [wik]
ɪ *bitten* [bɪtn̩]	ɪ *bit* [bɪt]
Y *Hütte* [hYtə]	
e *Leben* [lebən]	e, eɪ *orate* [ouret], *aid* [eɪd]
ø *schön* [ʃøn]	
ɛ *setzen* [zɛtsən]	ɛ *set* [sɛt]
œ *öffnen* [œfnən]	
	æ *at* [æt]
a *aus* [aʊs][3]	a *out* [aʊt]
ɑ *Rat* [řɑt]	ɑ *calm* [kɑm]
ɔ *nord* [nɔřt][2]	ɔ *law* [lɔ]

[2] Instead of [ř], [ʀ] or [ʁ] is common. In the final part of a syllable, as in *Vater* or *der*, *r* may fade to something closely resembling [ə].

[3] Note that the diphthongs are rendered in several ways in the different dialects.

	ʌ *up* [ʌp]
o *so* [zo]	o, ou *oration* [o'reɪʃən], *road* [roud]
u *Mutter* [mutəř][4]	u *put* [put]
u *tun* [tun]	u *tool* [tul]
	ɜ *bird,* E, S [bɜd]
	ɝ *bird* GA [bɝd]
ə *Knabe* [knabə]	ə *Cuba* [kjubə]
	ɝ *mother* GA [mʌðɝ]
DIPHTHONGS	
	eɪ *day* [deɪ]
	ou *no* [nou]
au, ɑu, ɑu, ɔo *zaun* [tsaun][3], etc.	au, ɑu, ɑu *town* [taun], etc.
aɪ, ɑɪ, ɑi, ɑY, ɛɪ *fein* [faɪn][3], etc.	aɪ, ɑɪ, ɑi *fine* [faɪn], etc.
ɔɪ, ɔY, ɔi *Bäume* [bɔɪmə][1], etc.	ɔɪ, ɔi *boy* [bɔɪ], etc.
	ju *you* [ju]
	ɪə *ear,* E, S [ɪə]
	oɔ *more,* S [moɔ]
	ɔɔ *for,* alternate E, S [fɔɔ]
	uə *poor,* E, S [puə]
	ɛə *there,* E, S [ðɛə]
	æə *fair,* S [fæə]

Gross Differences Among Analogous German and American English Sounds

1. The American English voiceless plosives [p, t, k], when used initially in stressed syllables, are strongly aspirate—i.e., each is pronounced with a strong plosion or puff of air. The German initial [p, t, k] are relatively unaspirate—i.e., there is little plosion. The English ear confuses these voiceless unaspirate sounds with the corresponding voiced unaspirate sounds [b, d, g]. Thus the German speaker's rendition of *pay* resembles *bay, team* resembles *deem, coat* resembles *goat,* etc. Obviously, the German-speaking student must learn to speak initial [p, t, k] in stressed syllables with stronger plosion than that to which he is accustomed.

2. American English [t, d, n] are alveolar—i.e., in producing them the tongue touches the alveolar ridge, somewhat back of the upper teeth. German [t, d, n] are farther front and often dental—i.e., the tongue touches a point on the hard palate farther front than for the English sounds, often touching the teeth themselves. The German speaker should practice such words as the following to habituate himself in making the contact of the tongue on the alveolar ridge, not against the teeth: *tea* [ti]; *till* [tɪł]; *tale* [teɪł]; *tell* [tɛł]; *tattle* [tætł]; *tar* E, S [tɑ:], GA [tɑr]; *torn* E, S [tɔ:n], GA [tɔrn]; *toll* [toułł]; *took* [tuk]; *tool* [tułł]; *turn* E, S [tɜ:n] GA [tɝn]; *tired* E, S [taɪəd], GA [taɪrd]; *tower* E, S [tauə], GA [tauɝ]; *toil* [tɔɪł]; *deed* [did]; *did* [dɪd]; *date* [deɪt]; *debt* [dɛt]; *dank* [dæŋk]; *dark* E, S [dɑ:k], GA [dɑrk]; *dormer* E, S [dɔ:mə], GA [dɔrmɝ]; *dale* [deɪł]; *dull* [dʌł]; *do* [du]; *dirt* E, S [dɜ:t], GA [dɝt]; *dire* E, S [daɪə], GA [daɪr]; *dower* E, S [dauə], GA [dauɝ]; *need* [nid]; *knit* [nɪt]; *nail*

[neɪɬ]; *net* [nɛt]; *gnat* [næt]; *gnarled* E, S [nɑːɬd], GA [nɑrɬd]; *north* E, S [nɔːθ], GA [nɔrθ]; *nose* [noʊz]; *nook* [nʊk]; *noose* [nus]; *nine* [naɪn]; *now* [naʊ].

3. The German *l* is front (often dental) or clear; even with back vowels it is clearer than American English *l*. The general American *l* is dark, i.e. [ɬ], in all positions, as in *lean* [ɬin], *valley* [vælɪ], *hill* [hɪɬ], and the Southern and Eastern American *l* is dark with back vowels and finally, as in *law* [ɬɔ], *reel* [rɪɬ]. The sound [ɬ] is made with the tip of the tongue touching the alveolar ridge. The following are good for practicing [ɬ]: low [ɬoʊ], *loom* [ɬum], *lord* [ɬɔrd, ɬɔːd], *Lowell* [ɬoʊəl], *fall* [fɔɬ], *rill* [rɪɬ], *kneel* [niɬ].

4. The sounds [e] and [o] are single sounds in German. In American English they are, with rare exception in certain lightly stressed syllables, diphthongs, viz., [eɪ] and [oʊ]. The learner should practice such words as *eight* [eɪt], *made* [meɪd], *train* [treɪn], *oak* [oʊk], *approach* [əproʊtʃ], *comb* [koʊm], etc.

5. Certain German spellings, when encountered in English, may confuse the German who is attempting to speak English. Among these are the following:

a. German *w*—pronounced [v] (in some dialects [β]). English [w] is a sound which begins with [u] and glides to the following vowel. The German learner may practice *we* [wi] by saying [u-i] and quickening it to [wi]. Likewise he can develop [u-iʃ] into [wɪʃ], etc. The German speaker must be on guard continually against pronouncing *w* as [v] in English.

b. German *v*—pronounced [f]. The speaker should practice saying *vale* [veɪɬ], not [feɪɬ][5]; *vault* [vɔɬt], not [fɔɬt]; *vine* [vaɪn], not [faɪn], etc.

c. German final *b*—pronounced [p]; final *d*—pronounced [t]; and final *g*—pronounced [ç] after front vowels, and [x] and [k] ([k] for stage and for some sections and individuals) after back vowels. (In some dialects, intervocalic *g* is pronounced [ɣ].) Examples: *crib* [krɪb], not [krɪp]; *fad* [fæd], not [fæt]; *drag* [dræg], not [dræç] or [dræk]; *wagon* [wægən], not [wæɣən]; etc.

d. German initial and medial *s*—pronounced [z]. Examples: *sing* [sɪŋ], not [zɪŋ]; *so* [soʊ], not [zoʊ]; *say* [seɪ], not [zeɪ]; *erasing* [iˈreɪsɪŋ], not [iˈreɪzɪŋ]; etc.

e. German *j*—pronounced [j]. Examples: *just* [dʒʌst], not [jʌst]; *jump* [dʒʌmp], not [jʌmp]; *Jack* [dʒæk], not [jæk]; etc.

6. German uses (most noticeably in poetry and oratory) the glottal stop, [ʔ], before a stressed syllable beginning with a vowel. The learner should omit it, or at least reduce its conspicuousness in English. Example, *This evening* [ðɪs ivənɪŋ], not [ðɪs ʔivənɪŋ].

7. German *ng* is pronounced only [ŋ], never [ŋg] as often in English. Examples: *finger* E, S [fɪŋgə], GA [fɪŋgɚ], not [fɪŋə] or [fɪŋɚ]; *linger* E, S [lɪŋgə], GA [ɬɪŋgɚ], not [lɪŋə] or [ɬɪŋɚ]; *longer* E, S [ɬɔŋgə], GA [ɬɔŋgɚ], not [ɬɔŋə] or [ɬɔŋɚ]; etc.

With these facts as a leaping point, we can take up in more minute detail those sounds of English which offer problems to the German learner.

II[6]—Teaching English to Speakers of German Detailed Differences Among English and German Sounds

A. Sounds of English Not in German

A re-examination of the sound systems

[5] In order to isolate the problems so that they can be dealt with one at a time, only the error immediately under consideration appears in the transcription throughout the examples following; the remaining sounds of a given word are represented as if the learner had already mastered them.

[6] Throughout Section II of this article the references to tension, pitch, duration, projection (see definition), and voicing are based on Mr. Cohen's personal observations of his pupils in the Hana Unger Speech Studio of New York City.

of English and German in I will reveal that certain English sounds do not appear in German at all. These exclusively English sounds are listed below, together with a number of the English sounds already mentioned which have German analogs not closely resembling the corresponding English sounds. The substitutions which the German speaker will at first almost inevitably make for these various sounds are discussed in the paragraphs immediately following the list.

Vowels

[æ, ɒ, ʌ, ɜ, ɝ, ɚ]

Diphthongs

[eɪ, oʊ, ju, ɪə, æə, ɛə, oə, ɔə, uə]

Consonants

[ɬ, r, ɾ, ɻ, θ, ð, ʒ, w, ʍ]

1. There is no [æ] in German. The common substitution for [æ] is [ɛ]; it is difficult for the German to distinguish between *medicine* and *Madison*. The learner must drop the tongue somewhat lower for [æ] than for [ɛ], so as to break the contact of the sides of the tongue with the upper teeth. If he knows French, he may accept the vowel of *père, frère, mère, etc.* (despite the fact that it belongs to the French [ɛ]–phoneme), as being a close approximation of English [æ]. A valuable sort of drill consists of pairing words which are similar except for [ɛ] and [æ] and pronouncing them so as to distinguish them accurately. Examples:

met [mɛt]–*mat* [mæt]
pet [pɛt]–*pat* [pæt]
pen [pɛn]–*pan* [pæn]
send [sɛnd]–*sand* [sænd]
betting [bɛtɪŋ]–*batting* [bætɪŋ]
led [lɛd]–*lad* [læd]

Occasionally [ɑ] appears as a substitute for [æ], especially where the English spelling or the analogous German word suggests it. *That* is a good example; both the spelling and the analogous *dass* suggest [dɑt] to the German speaker.

2. The sound [a] ordinarily occurs in both English and German only in the diphthongs [aɪ] and [aʊ] as in *ice* [aɪs], *eis* [aɪs] and *out* [aʊt], *aus* [aʊs]. However, in English it occurs in isolation as a substitute for [aɪ] in substandard Southern speech, as in the incorrect [a] for *I* [aɪ], and as an alternate for [ɑ] in words spelled with *ar* in Eastern speech, such as in *car* [kɑ:], *park* [pɑ:k], etc. In the instance of the New England pronunciation, the German speaker substitutes [ɑ], which is, of course, a correct alternate pronunciation. He may, then, reasonably be permitted to go on saying [kɑ:], [pɑ:k], etc., or he may front the tongue and produce [a]. But in any case, it will be well for him to learn to use [a] in diphthongs, so as to be able to say *I* [aɪ], *owl* [aʊl], etc., instead of the less common [ɑɪ] and [ɑʊl].

3. The sound [ʌ] does not occur in German. Various substitutes are used: in *truck* [trʌk], [ɑ] may appear, producing [trɑk]; in *up* [ʌp], [u] may appear, producing [up]; in *jump* [dʒʌmp] and *just* [dʒʌst], [ʊ] may appear, producing [dʒʊmp] and [dʒʊst]. The American sound [ʌ] is very nearly a central sound, the tongue being placed only slightly lower and farther back than for [ə].[7] Examples for drill: *duck* [dʌk], not [dɑk]; *such* [sʌtʃ], not [sɑtʃ] or [sʊtʃ]; but [bʌt], not [bɑt].

4. The sound [ɒ], used alternatively with [ɑ] in Eastern American in words like *hot* [hɒt, hɑt], does not occur in German. For [ɒ], the German speaker substitutes either German [ɔ] or [ɑ]. When [ɑ] is used, it may reasonably be let alone. However, if the teacher or pupil particularly desires [ɒ], the pupil will have to learn it. It is made with the tongue ordinarily higher and always farther back than for [ɑ]. It is, moreover, a brief, lax sound, as compared with [ɔ], which it otherwise resembles

[7] For British [ʌ] the tongue is much lower and farther back, not far from the position for [ɑ].

considerably. Examples for drill, contrasting [ɒ] with both [ɑ] and [ɔ]:

calm [kɑ:m]—*cot,* E [kɒt, kɑt]—*caught* [kɔt]

hearty, S [hɑ:tɪ]—*hot,* E [hɒt, hɑt]—*haughty* [hɔtɪ]

not, GA, S [nɑt]—*not,* E [nɒt, nɑt]—*naught* [nɔt]

5. As earlier noted, the diphthong [eɪ] does not occur in German, and the German speaker substitutes the continental pure vowel [e]. The speaker should practice word lists such as are given in I.

6. As stated in I, the diphthong [oʊ] likewise does not occur in German. The German speaker substitutes the continental pure [o]. Practice on words like those given in I is indicated.

Note. In teaching English diphthongs to the speaker of German, great care must be exercised (1) that the secondary element [ɪ] does not become the German vowel [i], (2) that the secondary element [ʊ] does not become the German vowel [u], and, (3) that all secondary elements never become independent vowels, but acquire instead the vanishing quality characteristic of those English diphthongs which are stressed on the first diphthongal element, viz., [eɪ, aɪ, aʊ, ɔɪ].

7. None of the universally used American *r*'s, viz., [r, ɹ, ɾ], nor the GA [ɝ, ɚ], nor the related S, E [ɜ], occurs in German. The German *r* is basically either the tongue-point trill, [ř], or the uvular trill, [ʀ], as in *reden* [ředn̩] or [ʀedn̩]. The uvular trill often weakens to the uvular scrape, [ʁ], as in *wer* [vɛʁ], or, in final positions, even fades toward [ə], as in *wer* [vɛə]. The General American *r,* except where the fricative [ɹ] occurs after plosives, as in *drive* [dɹaɪv], is the frictionless [r] wherever it appears in the spelling; the Southern and Eastern American *r* is like the General American except in final and preconsonantal positions, where it is either silent, as in *jar* [dʒɑ:] and *card* [kɑ:d], or pronounced [ə], as in *poor* [puə] and *hours* [aʊəz]; the Eastern intervocalic *r* is often [ɾ], as in *fury* [fjʊɪɪ]. The frictionless [r] is made by most speakers by pointing the tip of the tongue upward and backward toward the center of the roof of the mouth; by some speakers by placing the tip of the tongue behind the lower teeth and arching the blade of the tongue toward the center of the roof of the mouth. There must be no vibration (trilling) of either the tip of the tongue or of the uvula. The tongue must not touch the hard palate. The learner should practice words like *reel* [rił], *roll* [roʊł], *rail* [reɪł], *fret* [frɛt], *pray* [preɪ], *rob* [rɑb, rɒb], *raw* [rɔ], *probe* [proʊb], *rook* [rʊk], *prove* [pruv].

The fricative [ɹ] is made with the tongue closer to the hard palate than for the frictionless [r], but the learner need make no particular effort to make the adjustment, since it usually happens automatically when *r* follows a plosive, as in *try* [tɹaɪ], *dry* [dɹaɪ], *cry* [kɹaɪ], *grind* [gɹaɪnd], *bride* [bɹaɪd], *pride* [pɹaɪd].

Intervocalic *r* is the frictionless [r] in all American dialects, except alternately in Eastern, where it is [ɾ], the one-tap trill, made by vibrating the tongue against the palate for a single stroke. Examples: *very* [vɛɪɪ, vɛɾɪ], *far away* [fɑr əweɪ, fɑr əweɪ], etc.

For the General American dialect, the student can develop with only minor modification (slight lowering and backing) the frictionless [r], already learned, into the unstressed sound [ɚ], for words ending in vowel plus *r,* like *mortar* [mɔrtɚ], *mother* [mʌðɚ], *fakir* [feɪkɚ], *labor* [leɪbɚ], *nature* [neɪtʃɚ], *martyr* [mɑrtɚ].

For the Eastern and Southern dialect, [ə], which the German speaker already knows in such words as *bitte* [bɪtə], *Stimme* [ʃtɪmə], serves in final unstressed syllables spelled with vowel plus *r,* as well as for *r* in stressed syllables after all

vowels except [ɜ], [ɑ] and sometimes [ɔ]. Examples: *tartar* [tɑ:tə], *tapir* [teɪpə], *sister* [sɪstə], *odor* [oʊdə], *murmur* [mɜ:mə], *satyr* [seɪtə], *fear* [fɪə], *there* [ðɛə], *pear* [pæə, pɛə], *door* [doə, dɔə, dɔ:], *pure* [pjʊə], *fire* [faɪə], *flour* [flaʊə], etc.

By lengthening and centralizing the frictionless [r], the student can achieve a very satisfactory GA [ɝ] for use in *heard* [hɝd,] *murmur* [mɝmɝ], *turn* [tɝn], etc. The tongue is mid-central and (for most speakers) retroflex.

The [ɜ] does not occur in German. For the Southern and Eastern dialects, the tongue position of the frictionless [r], omitting the pointing upward and backward (retroflection) will give a satisfactory [ɜ] for such words as: *bird* [bɜ:d], *murmur* [mɜ:mə], *turn* [tɜ:n], etc. The tongue is mid-central. For the Eastern [ɜ], the lips are unround; for the Southern [ɜ], the lips are half-round. Common substitutions for the E, S [ɜ] are the [ø] of *Kőnig* [køniç] or a member of the [ɛ] phoneme most nearly approximated in English by the principal vowel in *there,* E, S [ðɛə]; GA [ðɛr]. Thus, E, S *bird* [bɜ:d] may be pronounced [bød] or [bɛ:d].

For the General American [ɝ] as in *bird* [bɝd] the usual substitution is [ɛr̆] or [ɛʀ] or, as explained in I, [ɛʀ] or even [ɛə]. Thus *bird* may be heard as [bɛr̆d], [bɛʀd], [bɛʀd], or possibly [bɛəd]. The likelihood of the occurrence of these substitutions in general American is indicated by the order of the transcriptions in the previous sentence.

Examples for drill: *burn* [bɜ:n] or [bɝn], not [bøn], [bɛʀn], etc.; *heard* [hɜ:d] or [hɝd], not [hød], [hɛʀd], etc.; *curl* [kɜ:l] or [kɝl], not [køl], [kɛʀl], etc.

8. The sound [ð] does not occur in German. The German speaker substitutes either [z] or [d]. The more educated speakers lean toward [z], which, being a fricative continuant, in some degree suggests the fricative continuant [ð] to the ear; the less educated speakers tend to use [d], which has a closely related tongue position. Both types of speakers must learn the rather delicate adjustment required to place the tongue in very light contact with the inner surface of the tips of the upper front teeth, in order that the air may be constricted as it passes through the interstices between the teeth and tongue, so as to produce the characteristic buzzing voiced fricative continuant sound [ð]. This sound is often called interdental, and it may indeed be made by thrusting the tongue between the upper and lower teeth. But the interdental position is awkward and conspicuous, and by no means necessary; the postdental position just described is preferable. Examples for practice: *this* [ðɪs], *that* [ðæt], *these* [ðiz], *those* [ðoʊz], *rhythm* [rɪðəm], *with* [wɪð],[8] etc.

9. The substitution for [θ] is either [s] or [t]. As suggested by the analogical use of [z] and [d] for [ð], [s] tends to be the choice of the more educated, [t] of the less educated. The formation of [θ] is identical with that of [ð], except that the vocal bands are quiescent, allowing the sound to remain unvoiced. Practice *thing* [θɪŋ], *throw* [θroʊ], *thought* [θɔt], *with* [wɪθ], etc.

10. The sound [ʒ] does not occur in German. However, its use is common in loan words from French. It is variously made by the German speaker of English in accord with the normal German tendency of partially unvoicing a voiced sibilant in medial positions. In final positions, the German [ʃ] is always substituted for [ʒ], save where the French influence is so strong that the final sound of such a borrowed word as *beige* [beʒ] remains partially or fully voiced. Exam-

[8] The word *with* tends to end with [ð] when the following word begins with a voiced sound, but [θ] when the following word begins with a voiceless sound.

(aspiration) than in English. Initially and medially, it may be voiced a trifle, or at least may give the effect of voicing by reason of its lesser aspiration. The student should practice strongly aspirated [p], especially initially. Examples for drill; these pairs should be pronounced so as to produce strong contrast between [p] and [b]: *pail–bail* [peɪł–beɪł], *Poe–bow* [poʊ–boʊ], *pie–by* [paɪ–baɪ], etc.

13. The [m] in German is a little less projected (see definition) and the minutest trifle shorter in duration than it is in English.[16]

14. The substitution of [v] for [w] has been touched upon in I. It may be added that when the German has acquired English he will also substitute [w] for [ʍ]. To acquire [ʍ], sometimes interpreted as [hw], the student should practice such words as *why* [ʍaɪ], *where* [ʍɛr, ʍɛə], *when* [ʍɛn], etc. Contrast *which* [ʍɪtʃ], *witch* [wɪtʃ]; *wheel* [ʍił], *weal* [wił]; *what* [ʍɑt], *Watt* [wɑt]; etc.

15. The German [f] is voiced just a little in initial and medial positions; in final positions, it is made with too much friction to pass well for English [f], often acquiring a hissing quality. The student should practice completely voiceless [f] in *fine* [faɪn], *fowl* [faʊł], *offing* [ɔfɪŋ], *lift* [lɪft], etc.

16. The German [d] is partially unvoiced in initial and medial positions, voiceless in final positions. The difference in the German sound results largely from the fact that the voiced breath is neither adequate nor held sufficiently for the duration of the sound, and the tip of the tongue is placed weakly and indefinitely against the hard palate and teeth instead of firmly on the palate immediately back of the teeth. The student should practice the completely voiced [d] in *deal* [dił], *reading* [ridɪŋ], *seed* [sid], etc.

17. The sound [t] in German is, as noted earlier, made with less plosion than in English: initially and medially, it is very slightly voiced. The difference in the German sound results largely from the fact that the tip of the tongue is not, as in English, pointed and pressed firmly against the hard palate immediately back of the teeth, "snapped" back and down, and released with dry plosion. Instead, it is articulated in a lax fashion, with indefinite tongue contact.

The German speaker sometimes substitutes [ts] for English [t] in initial positions. The explanation for this seems to lie in the fact that the German *z* has this pronunciation in certain positions, and its frequent occurrence in words cognate in German and English, such as *zehn* and *ten*, may be the direct cause of this substitution. Examples: *ten* [tɛn], not [tsɛn]; *toll* [toʊł], not [tsoʊł]; *time* [taɪm], not [tsaɪm]; etc.

18. The sound [n] in German is acoustically a little less projected (see definition) and a trifle shorter in duration than in English.

19. The substitution for the initial English [r] is, as indicated earlier, [ɾ] or [ʀ] or [ʁ]. Infrequently, and only after the German user of [ʀ] has acquired spoken English, he will substitute [w] for [r], since there is a [w]-like component in the lip position of [ʀ].

20. In German [z] is more sibilant in quality, lower in frequency, and longer in duration than it is in English. Initially and medially, it is partially unvoiced, as in the case of [b] and [d]. The difference in the German sound results largely from the fact that the voiced breath is neither adequate nor held

[16] The fact is that [n], [m], [ŋ] in German are less projected than in English because of the tendency of the German language to emphasize their lower harmonics, whereas the true nature of English nasal continuants requires emphasis of their higher overtones. This difference may be detected, especially in the sound of [n], when a German pronounces the word *meins* and an American, the word *mince*.

sufficiently for the duration of the sound, the tip of the tongue is neither raised nor pointed enough, and the time-pattern is much too long.

21. The sound [s] in German is very much more sibilant in quality, lower in frequency, and very much longer in duration than it is in English. Since *s* is pronounced [z] in German in initial and medial positions, the German substitutes [z] for [s] in these positions. The student should practice pairs of words like the following, carefully contrasting initial [s] and [z]: *seal* [sił], *zeal* [ził]; *sack* [sæk], *Zack* [zæk]; *sown* [soʊn], *zone* [zoʊn]. Since initial *c* in borrowed words is pronounced [ts] in German, as in *Citron* [tsɪtron], *Cicada* [tsɪkɑdɑ], etc., the sound [ts] is sometimes substituted where [s] is spelled with initial *c* in English, as in *city*, producing [tsɪtɪ]. The student should practice using [s] only in such words as *cell* [sɛł], not [tsɛł]; *ceiling* [silɪŋ], not [tsilɪŋ]; etc.[17]

22. The sound [ʃ] in German is very much more sibilant in quality, lower in frequency, and very, very much longer in duration than it is in English. The difference in the foreign sound results largely from the fact that the lips are protruded farther than in English, and the blade of the tongue is not raised so high.

23. The sound [tʃ] in German is more sibilant in quality, lower in frequency, and longer in duration than it is in English. In all positions, the German [ʃ] is often substituted for [tʃ], despite the fact that [tʃ] is common in the German language, as in *plätchern* [plœtʃərn], *Klatsch* [klɑtʃ]. The student should practice [tʃ] in such words as *chief* [tʃif], *chimes* [tʃaɪmz], *such* [sʌtʃ], etc.

[17] The fact is that [n], [m], [ŋ] in German are less the German [s] and [z] can readily be accepted for most purposes without much, or any, modification, it is nevertheless advisable that the frequencies be raised so that the danger of an effect of lisping is materially lessened or entirely avoided.

24. The sound [j] in German is a little less voiced and a little shorter in duration than it is in English.

25. The sound [h] in German is a little less aspirate in quality than it is in English.

26. The sound [g] in German is minutely unvoiced in initial and medial positions; cf. [b], [d], and [g]. The difference in the foreign sound results largely from the fact that the voiced breath is neither adequate nor held sufficiently for the duration of the sound. Examples for practice, to be pronounced with complete voicing of [b, d, g]: *bay* [beɪ], *abbey* [æbɪ], *day* [deɪ], *adding* [ædɪŋ], *gay* [geɪ], *haggle* [hægəł].

27. The sound [k] in German is, as explained earlier, made with less plosion than in English; initially and medially, it is voiced very slightly. Examples for practice, to be pronounced with completely unvoiced [k]: *key* [ki], *trickle* [trɪkəł].

28. Of the nasal continuants, the sound [ŋ] in German is closest to its English analog, being to a minute degree less projected (see definition) and almost imperceptibly shorter in duration than it is in English.[18]

Note. When the student has acquired spoken English, his tendency will be to add [ə] to words ending in [b], [v], [ð], [d], [z], [ʒ], [dʒ], and [g]—a fault which is not too easily corrected. He should practice imploded [b, d, g] (i.e., [b, d, g] made without breaking contact of lips or tongue and thus without final plosion) in such words as *tub* [tʌb], *cab* [kæb], *flag* [flæg], and should pronounce without a succeeding [ə] the final consonants of words like the following: thus, *leave* [liv], not [livə]; *breathe* [brið], not [briðə]; *ease* [iz], not [izə], *bridge* [brɪdʒ], not [brɪdʒə].

[18] Although good German usage does not admit of the stops [g] and [k] with the pure sound [ŋ], nevertheless many Germans do "click" the [ŋ] in English, either because of Slavic influence or because English spelling allows different pronunciations of the same letters, as in *singer* and *finger*, and confuses the Germans when they hear the latter pronounced [fiŋgɚ, fiŋgə] but yet are not allowed to do the same with *singer*. In teaching, however, this error is easily corrected.

III—Teaching German to Speakers of English

An examination of I and II will yield many suggestions to the speaker of English who wishes to learn German. However, there are certain German sounds which do not occur in English and which, therefore, demand specific treatment here. An examination of the parallel columns of paired English and German sounds in I will show that the totally non-English sounds—that is, the sounds which do not, like [p, t, k, e, o], etc., have English analogs—are as follows:

German Sounds Not in English

Vowels

y, Y, ø, œ

Consonants

β, Φ, ç, x, ɣ, ř, ʀ, ʁ, ʊ, ꜰ

Since [β], [Φ], [ɣ], and [ꜰ] occur only in dialectal German, space for describing them need not be taken here. There remain [ç], [x], [ř], [ʀ], [ʁ], and [ʊ].

1. As noted in I, [ç] actually occurs in English; but since in English it is a part of the [h]-phoneme, not a separate phoneme as in German, it is not recognized by the speaker of English when he encounters it in German. The most economical way of learning [ç] is to pronounce English words containing it and then adapt the sound to German words. Such English words are: *hue* [çu], *huge* [çudʒ], and *human* [çumən].[19] From these a correct pronunciation of the German word *ich* may be evolved as follows:

a. Pronounce, e.g., *hue* [çu], making sure that the initial part of the word is pronounced with sufficient force and aspiration to produce a prominent [ç].
b. Place the sound [ɪ] before the same word and pronounce the combination thus: [ɪ-çu].
c. Omit the sound [u] from the combination above and pronounce [ɪç].
d. Apply the sound thus learned to other German words, thus: *mich* [mɪç], *dich* [dɪç], *sich* [zɪç], *wenig* [venɪç], etc.

2. The [x] may now be developed with ease from the [ç] because of the fortunate fact that the tongue shifts from the [ç]-position to the [x]-position automatically when a back vowel is substituted in a word containing a front vowel.

a. Pronounce *ich* [ɪç]. (Restore it to mind by the sequence above, if necessary.)
b. Substituting [ɑ] for [ɪ] and pronounce *ich, ach* thus: [ɪç, ɑx].
c. Apply the newly learned sound to other pairs such as *nicht, Nacht,* [nɪçt, nɑxt]; *Licht, lacht* [lɪçt, lɑxt].
d. Apply the [x] in other German words, such as *machen* [mɑxən], *Dach* [dɑx], *Bach* [bɑx], *Tag* [tɑx], etc.

For the record, it may be stated that to produce [ç], the tip of the tongue presses against the inner surfaces of the lower teeth and the blade of the tongue arches toward the front part of the hard palate so that there is a horizontally wide, but vertically very small aperture between the tongue and the palate, through which the air passes under considerable pressure with a fricative, breathy sound. The nasal passage is, of course, closed by the soft palate, and the vocal bands are not vibrating. The sound [x] is made identically, except that the back of the tongue arches toward the soft palate to make a horizontally wide but vertically small aperture in the back of the mouth, corresponding to that in the front of the mouth for [ç].

3. The sound [ʀ] has, unfortunately, only one analog in English, and that is scarcely a linguistic sound; it is the

[19] The [ç] appears best in these words when they are spoken forcefully, with excessive tension and breath on the initial portion. Otherwise they may be pronounced [hju], [hjudʒ], [hjmən].

sound of snoring. Moreover, the snoring sound is made with the inspired breath, whereas [ʀ] is made with the expired or exhaled breath. But the vibrator is in each case the same, viz., the pendulous, fleshy central tip of the soft palate called the uvula. (Hence [ʀ] is called the uvular *r*.) Some students find it possible to make a beginning toward producing [ʀ] by first inducing the uvula to vibrate in a snoring sound and then reversing the direction of the breath stream, while continuing a similar uvular vibration. Once the student becomes able to make the sound independently, he can apply it to German words such as *reden* [ʀɛdən], *rot* [ʀot], *der* [dɛʀ], etc. As has been suggested, the so-called uvular scrape, [ʁ], is often used instead of [ʀ]. With this pronunciation, the words above would appear as [ʁɛdən], [ʁot], [dɛʁ]. And in final positions the [ʀ] or [ʁ] may fade to something nearly approximating [ə], so that *der* may appear as something very close to [dɛə].

Most students who have difficulty with [ʀ] are inclined to substitute the tongue-point trill, [ř], for it. Fortunately [ř] is a perfectly acceptable member of the German [r]-phoneme, since it is the standard *r* in the speech of many parts of Germany, as well as in stage German. Since it can be assumed that nearly every speaker of English can make [ř] without difficulty, there will be no need to take space to explain its formation here.

4. The [ʊ], or lax *v*, presents little difficulty. It is like the ordinary labiodental [v] except that the lower lip does not make firm contact with the upper teeth, but rather, makes a weak gesture toward establishing contact without actually touching the teeth, or touching them only very lightly. The sound [ʊ] occurs only after [k] and [ʃ], as in *Quelle* [kʊɛlə], *schwartz* [ʃʊarts], etc.

5. The German vowels not in English are all rounded front vowels, formed in a way foreign to the English language and consequently puzzling to the English speaker. Luckily each of these vowels is based on an analogous unround front vowel which is found in English and which is therefore perfectly familiar to the speaker. These analogs may be paired as follows:

i	y
ɪ	**Y**
e	ø
ɛ	œ

Each rounded vowel may be made simply by rounding the lips and attempting to pronounce the analogous unround sound, without compensating in any way for the handicap of the rounded lip position. Thus [y] is merely [i] spoken with the lips rounded. Obviously, it has a different tone quality by reason of the rounding; [Y] is [ɪ] spoken with lips rounded; [ø] is [e] spoken with lips rounded. [œ] is [ɛ] spoken with lips rounded. In each case, the lip rounding adds a characteristic difference of quality.

The learner needs by all means to hear these sounds spoken by a German or by a teacher who can make them perfectly. But having heard them, he can facilitate his own speed and perfection of acquiring them by following the suggestions above.

Practice lists

[y]:—*kühl* [kyl], *fühlen* [fylən], *müde* [mydə], *über* [ybəř], *grün* [gřyn], *mühe* [myə],[20] etc.

[Y]:—*Hütte* [hYtə], *üppig* [Ypiç], *misgünstig* [mɪsgYnstiç], *müssen* [mYsən], *Müller* [mYləř], *mündlich* [mYntliç], etc.

[ø]:—*mögen* [møgən], *hören* [høřən], *Vögel* [føgəl], *König* [køniç],[21] etc.

[20] Frequently, particularly in proper names, *ü* is written *ue*.

[21] Frequently, especially in proper names, *ö* is written *oe*.

[œ]:—*öffentlich* [œfəntliç], *plötzlich* [plœtsliç], *Löffel* [lœfəl], *zwölf* [tsvœlf], etc.

6. It has already been pointed out that German [e] and [o] are single vowels and not the diphthongal [eɪ] and [oʊ]; that German [l] tends to be clear or front; that German initial [p, t, k] are less aspirated than English [p, t, k]; that German [t, d, n] are more nearly dental than English [t, d, n]; that German orthographic final [b, d, g] are unvoiced to [p, t, ç-k]; and that German initial and medial *s* (but not *ss*) is pronounced [z].

7. It remains to be mentioned that from the standpoint of the English-speaking learner there are a few idiosyncracies of German spelling likely to be confusing.

a. The English speaker must resolutely pronounce German *z* as [ʦ]. Thus, *Zahn* [ʦɑn], *Zimmer* [ʦɪmər̆], *zu* [ʦu], *Zucker* [ʦʊkər̆], etc.

b. Having learned that German *z* is pronounced [ʦ], the student must take care not to pronounce initial German *s* as [ʦ]. Thus *sein* [zaɪn], not [ʦaɪn]. Likewise *See* [ze]. *Sommer* [zɔmər̆], etc.

c. Orthographic *ng* is never [ŋg] in German. Thus, *Finger* [fɪŋər̆], not [fɪŋgər̆]. Likewise *fangen* [fɑŋən], *Zeitungen* [ʦaɪtuŋən], etc.

THE PERILS OF RHETORICAL CRITICISM

LOREN D. REID
University of Missouri

THE last twenty years have noted several events of importance to those interested in the study of public address. The year 1925 saw the publication of the *Studies in Rhetoric and Public Speaking in Honor of James A. Winans;* 1928 saw the first doctorates in rhetoric and public speaking, the beginning of a group of studies which by 1943 had reached a total of more than fifty, awarded by eight different graduate schools;[1] 1939 saw the publication of Thonssen and Fatherson's *Bibliography of Speech Education,* with its more than 200 pages of entries in rhetoric and public speaking. Last year brought *A History and Criticism of American Public Address,* with its studies of the speech backgrounds of the Colonial, Early National, and Later National periods; of special topics like the teaching of rhetoric and the speaking of famous women and of twenty-eight outstanding American speakers.[2] The October, 1943, issue of the QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH, which announced and reviewed these two volumes, also contained articles on research in American public speaking by Dickey,[3] Baird,[4] and Aly.[5] Committees on contemporary and on regional public address have already begun work.

Perhaps now is a good time to look over what has been done, and to make certain observations, chiefly to draw from the practice of the last twenty years principles which may be useful during the next twenty.

I

Any concept of criticism is unfolded

[1] Columbia, Cornell, Iowa, Louisiana State University, Michigan, Northwestern, Southern California, Wisconsin. (From data reported annually by Franklin D. Knower in *Speech Monographs.*)

[2] Two volumes (1943), published under the auspices of the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS OF SPEECH.

[3] Dallas C. Dickey, "What Directions Should Future Research in American Public Address Take?", pp. 300-304.

[4] A. Craig Baird, "Opportunities for Research in State and Sectional Public Speaking," pp. 304-308.

[5] Bower Aly, "The History of American Public Address as a Research Field," pp. 308-314.

by considering what it is not. For example:

1. *Rhetorical criticism*[6] *is not simply a discussion of the speaker's ideas.* In its most elemental form this procedure is merely a summary: the speaker's first point was that Greek resistance delayed the advance of the Axis, his second point that the time saved made it possible to strengthen the British army. Such a discussion is slightly more critical when the writer adds a few rhetorical labels: The speaker used "emotional appeal" in his conclusion when he pictured the wounded Evzone returning to the smoking ruins of his village. A still more useful variety of criticism results when the critic analyzes a series of speeches and ferrets out the assumptions and the principal lines of argument. Even then, however, the critical task is incomplete.

Although the reader needs to know what the speaker *said,* he really seeks a critical judgment *about* the ideas of the speech. The critic should study not alone the result of invention, but the inventive process; not alone the result of arrangement and composition, but the speaker at work: what Thomas Wolfe calls "the whole stroke, catch, flow, stop, and ending, the ten thousand fittings, changings, triumphs, and surrenders."[7] It is the job that Lowes undertook for Coleridge, and that DeVoto is undertaking for Mark Twain. It is shown, in briefer scale, in several instances in the *History and Criticism:* for example, Wallace's analysis[8] of the ideas of Booker T. Washington and his methods of adaptation to his audiences; Wiley's study[9] of the composition of Lincoln's First Inaugural; Whan's picture[10] of Douglas analyzing his Illinois audiences. A really thorough execution of this aspect of rhetorical criticism can be made only about a speaker who is interested both in the art and the practice of oratory, who keeps copious journals showing the development of his ideas, who saves all of the notes and preliminary drafts of his speeches, and who bequeaths to his rhetorical executors a super-Hyde Park library, containing the above plus a set of electrical transcriptions of all his speeches.

2. *Rhetorical criticism is not simply a narrative of the circumstances under which a speech is delivered.* As a profession we declare that the speech must be related to what we term "the speech situation." This requirement of rhetorical criticism is apparently satisfied by writing an "historical background." If, however, this introductory narrative is of the perfunctory sort readily gleaned from secondary sources, it serves no real critical function. Although it is helpful to be reminded of the dates of wars or the names of opposing candidates, such statements are only an approach to the analysis of the occasion, not the analysis itself.

The kind of setting in which to place a speech might better be conceived of as a "rhetorical" rather than as an "historical" background. After making a few general statements to refresh the memory of the reader about certain historical landmarks, the critic should develop details which serve to interpret the circumstances leading up to the delivery of the speech. These details are not likely to come from a college history textbook, but from letters, diaries, memoirs, and periodicals, and sometimes from specialized monographs.

To be specific, in analyzing the occasion of Churchill's address to Congress on December 26, 1941, it is only a part of the problem to review the state of the

[6] The term is used from habit; some prefer "oratorical criticism." Either is liable to be misunderstood by students in other fields. For general use the more accurate (though longer) term, "criticism of public address" is no doubt the one which meets with the approval of most scholars.

[7] *The Story of a Novel* (New York and London, 1936), p. 1.

[8] *Op. cit.*, I, 410 ff.

[9] *Ibid.*, II, 866-869.

[10] *Ibid.*, II, 807 ff.

war on that date. The critic should also attempt to answer these questions: Why was Churchill invited to speak? when? and by whom? What was his prestige at that time? What information did he have about the American national temper? Did Churchill discuss with Roosevelt, or with others, what he might say to Congress? Do earlier drafts of his speech throw any light upon his thinking? What advance publicity was given to the speech? Who was in the audience? and so on. Not all the answers to these questions may prove relevant, but most of them should reveal facts which would place the speech in its true setting. And such a treatment would take the research out of the dubious category of second-rate history and put it under the heading of first-rate criticism.

3. *Rhetorical criticism is not simply a classification or tabulation of rhetorical devices.* The use of quantitative measurements has been tried, but generally abandoned. As John W. Black points out briefly in his discussion of the sentence structure of Rufus Choate, tabulations do not describe style.[11] Or, as Brigance suggests in his discussion of Jeremiah S. Black, the power of the speaker's arguments is not to be measured by the number of spittoons the speaker fills during speech delivery.[12]

Statistical methods may be of some assistance in measuring a speaker's influence. The Whan study, previously cited, attempts to judge the comparative effectiveness of Lincoln and Douglas by a study of the election returns. Gleckler's study of Willkie's Presidential campaign speeches utilizes much poll information in search of an answer to the question of whether Willkie's speaking cost him the presidency.[13] Radio indexes and public opinion polls will continue to be helpful. The principal caution to be observed in using numerical devices is that no combination of tables, polls, or spittoons can tell the whole story about the effectiveness of a speech, though they may objectify certain aspects of the problem of criticism.

4. *Rhetorical criticism is not primarily an excursion into other fields of learning.* The critic is easily tempted to abandon criticism and instead to produce treatises upon politics, religion, historical movements, military strategy, and what not. He begins with the honorable intention of giving the reader a background of eighteenth-century naval theory in order to support his analysis of a speech about a certain naval disaster, but before long he has out-Mahaned Mahan, and is offering, under the guise of background, a long discussion somewhat removed from the field of criticism. It is easy to move from rhetoric into another field. Aristotle pointed out the danger: "People fail to notice that the more correctly they handle their particular subject the further they are getting away from pure rhetoric or dialectic."[14]

II

By now the first peril of rhetorical criticism has been pointed out: the strong possibility that the critic may produce something that is not criticism at all. This is the first and greatest peril. The minor perils are numerous; a few of them are worth noting for whatever light they may shed on the critical process.

1. *Choosing a subject for study.* The problem of choosing a subject has already been authoritatively discussed, and need not be recapitulated here.[15] Generally

[11] *Ibid.*, I, 456.

[12] *Ibid.*, I, 462. Says the observer quoted: "A small and easily surmountable case takes two spittons; a good tough argument requires four; for a great feat of legal gymnastics he requires as many as nine successive spittoons."

[13] Marion Gleckler, *The 1940 Campaign Speeches of Wendell Willkie* (Syracuse, unpublished master's thesis, 1943).

[14] *Rhetoric*, translated by W. Rhys Roberts, 1358a.

[15] See the articles referred to in footnotes 3, 4, and 5.

speaking, the choices are as follows:

a. *Choose an eminent speaker.* The advice is frequently given to "study the biggest man you can find" and make a more or less definitive criticism of his speechmaking, but as the field develops, this advice diminishes in practical usefulness.[16] A related possibility is to study some aspect of the speeches of an outstanding speaker: the *History and Criticism* suggests, among others, the legal addresses of Ingersoll, the occasional speaking of Black. Furthermore, there may be an excellent speaker who is not generally known—men who, like "Private John" Allen of Mississippi, wielded considerable influence in their regions while alive, but who, because they were not associated with great historical events, are easily forgotten.

Conservative scholarly opinion generally supports the advice to pick a big man. The sources of material about him are richer, and the investigator may adapt any of half a dozen patterns of study, already worked out, for the proper presentation of his data. Conservative scholarly opinion also advises that the big man be safely dead and buried, the principal reason being the prime necessity of critical perspective. The caution is especially observed in the writing of doctoral dissertations, though the writers of masters' essays are allowed to browse at will in contemporary fields of material. Recently some dwellers in the lunatic fringe have begun to question the scholarly prohibition upon contemporary speakers as sources of doctoral material. Historians are already writing about World War II, they point out, and biographers are turning out volumes on contemporary leaders. Although these works may contain some generalizations that will not be supported by later evidence, they will at least preserve a certain amount of contemporary data which otherwise would be lost. The career of former senator James A. Reed is an instance in point. No doubt a few were dissuaded from studying this Missouri orator while he was alive. On Friday, September 8, 1944, he died. On Saturday, September 9, according to the conservative thinkers, he acquired a partial eligibility for scholarly investigation. Yet now the critics will have to dig out of his papers answers to many questions they could have asked him personally.

b. *Study the everyday speaking of some region.* Anyone electing to study the speech of the man in the street is liable to meet the objection of some scholars that the only type of speechmaking worth studying is the speech of some literary or historical significance: Webster at Faneuil Hall, Wilson before Congress. How trivial these items seem:

Deliberative: George Stinson's speech at District No. 11 school house, opening his campaign ("Well, boys, we've got to get some efficiency in the sheriff's office . . .").

Forensic: The jury address of Attorney Tom LeBiquet, in the case of Hennessey *v.* Hamilton Motor Company ("Now as to the half-pound of emery dust which the said defendant is alleged to have put into the said plaintiff's crankcase . . .").

Occasional: The sermon of the Reverend Thomas Porter at the last rites of Harmon L ("Slick") Morgan ("To be sure, there was some ways in which Harmon's life was not entirely exemplary . . .").[17]

Yet scholars who look down at these examples might give much to know about the everyday speaking that went on in New Salem, Illinois, in the 1830's, in the hearing of young Abe Lincoln. Since it is difficult to know what in the contemporary speechmaking scene is worth preserving, the problem is to predict what will be of scholarly usefulness years hence.

[16] As Dickey suggests; *op. cit.*, p. 301.

[17] Gathered from observations made in Clarke County, Iowa.

In short, so far as the problems of choosing a subject are concerned, once the investigator leaves the well-traveled road he must assume, in the military phrase, a certain amount of calculated risk.

2. *Use of speech texts.* The only assuredly accurate text is one taken from an electrical transcription and carefully checked with the original recording. A stenographic report is fair, but if it has been revised by the speaker or his editor, it has undergone an unknown amount of alteration.[18] Newspaper summaries are uneven in quality. At the worst, they have been written by a reporter who got his ideas second-hand; at the best, they are summaries of a press copy sent out in advance, though reporters sometimes sit attentively through long speeches.

3. *Use of various methods of supporting a critical judgment.* Eventually the critic makes a judgment about the effectiveness of a speech. This judgment may be supported by at least three different types of material:

a. *Testimony: comments of the hearers.* Although every one who hears a speech is entitled to his opinion about it, the critic should not overlook the customary tests of authority: competence, honesty, lack of prejudice, propinquity. When John Finley says of Edwin Alderman, "I am sure that Pericles would not have spoken with a more melodious voice,"[19] or when Dean Briggs calls President Eliot "the finest speaker I have ever heard,"[20] or when Lord Brougham calls Charles Fox "the most accomplished debater that ever appeared upon the theatre of public affairs in any age of the world,"[21] criticism, like a free balloon, has cut loose from terra firma. The comments are colorful, but must be—and usually are—balanced against more accurate judgments.

b. *Precept: accepted rhetorical principles.* Many critics assume that if a speaker adheres to the precepts laid down by the great rhetoricians, chiefly Aristotle, he is an effective performer. Yet as the critic studies a speech text, glancing from the text to Aristotle and back again, he should be aware of some of the objections to this procedure. One is the objection that Aristotelian rhetoric stresses persuasion rather than clear and accurate statement. The argument has too many implications to be discussed here; perhaps we need first a body of criticism employing the semantic refinements of rhetoric in order to illustrate concretely what the semanticists have in mind.[22] Another is that the Aristotelian classification of speeches is incomplete. Certainly one more suited to modern speech occasions is that suggested by Gilman: *deliberative, professional, social, ceremonial,* and *invective,* each category having a number of subheadings.[23] Another is that the classification of the methods of persuasion as *ethical, logical,* and *pathetic* leads to confused thinking. Baldwin anticipated this objection, in part, twenty years ago, when he wrote: "That the three are not mutually exclusive is evident and must have been deliberate. Aristotle is telling us that rhetoric as an art is to be approached from these three directions and in this order."[24] The terms themselves are not too satisfactory. The term "pathetic proof" is awkward, especially when the critic speaks of "pathetic arguments" and "pathetic appeals." Some writers in

[18] This topic has been discussed previously by this writer. See "Factors Contributing to Inaccuracy in the Texts of Speeches," in *Papers in Rhetoric,* edited by Donald C. Bryant (St. Louis, 1940), pp. 39-45.

[19] Quoted by Charles A. Fritz in *A History and Criticism of American Public Address,* II, 553.

[20] Quoted by Louis M. Eich, *ibid.,* II, 526.

[21] Quoted by Loren D. Reid, *Charles James Fox: A Study of an Eighteenth Century Parliamentary Speaker* (Iowa City, 1932), p. 98.

[22] See Elwood Murray, "The Semantics of Rhetoric," QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH, XXX (February, 1944), 31-41.

[23] This classification originally appeared in Gilman, Aly, and Reid, *A Course Book in Public Speaking* (Columbia, Missouri, 1937), revised edition, pp. 23-25, but has since been further revised and mimeographed.

[24] *Ancient Rhetoric and Poetic* (1924), p. 11.

the *History and Criticism* preferred "emotional appeals" or the equivalent.[25] The term "ethical proof" is sometimes broadened to include not only the ways in which the speech itself persuades the listener to think well of the speaker, but also to embrace other sources of facts about his character and reputation.[26]

Aristotelian rhetoric cannot be made to cover every aspect of all types of speaking. Some modern treatises are more helpful in presenting the principles of exposition. Adequate standards are still being developed for the criticism of humor. The Aristotelian ideals of deliberative speaking do not seem to apply invariably to campaign speaking; here the goal is inoffensiveness of statement rather than persuasion or exact demonstration.[27] Often the most "competent" speakers are defeated for office. In fact, we may be entering a new era in American politics when the best way to be nominated may be to deny being a candidate, and the best way to be elected may be to make a small number of speeches. Moreover, students of discussion and of radio speaking are developing new terminology and techniques not to be found in the *Rhetoric*. Finally, Aristotle's comments on style, delivery, types of logical arguments, and classification of emotions are less useful than some of the terms, definitions, and classifications to be found in contemporary works. As these developments lead the critic away from Aristotle at many points, it is folly to think that the *Rhetoric* is the only book on the shelf.

c. *Comparison with other speeches.* A point of view which the critic must keep in mind is that of asking what a better speaker might have done under the same circumstances. This comparison yields two sorts of observations: First, it suggests that some ideas might have been presented more effectively; second, it reveals that some ideas, or some methods of treatment, might have been overlooked altogether.

The use of comparison has probably not yet been adequately exploited by the rhetorician, though it is a common device of literary and dramatic critics. In a recent study the judgment is expressed that Willkie's use of repetition, humor, epigram, and imagery was only mediocre. The examples cited are reasonably self-evident, but the conclusion seems even more forceful when comparisons are made with touchstones from Roosevelt and Churchill.[28]

The general procedure, strikingly illustrated by Matthew Arnold, demands a knowledge of what is undeniably good in the literature of public address. The approach seems especially meritorious in that it enables the critic to demonstrate pointedly excellences as well as shortcomings, particularly in relation to speech composition. Improperly used, it could become merely "the literary criticism of oratory" of the most subjective sort. Even when properly used, it demands verbatim accuracy of the texts

[25] Bower Aly uses the term "emotional proof" in *The Rhetoric of Alexander Hamilton* (1941), pp. 32, 142, and elsewhere.

[26] The term "rhetoric" itself needs some explanation and "rhetorical" is generally considered synonymous with "grandiloquent, aureate, flowery, bombastic." (See *Webster's Dictionary of Synonyms.*)

[27] As one contemporary puts it: "The task of maintaining an adequately non-committal position while appearing to assume a definite position on each issue is an extremely difficult one."

[28] An illustration of *repetition* from Willkie: "And the *victims* of its failure are the very persons whom it professes to represent and champion. The little business men are *victims* because their chances are more restricted than ever before. The farmers are *victims* because many of them are forced to subsist on what is virtually a dole. . . ." Compare this use of repetition—the only one in his Acceptance Speech—with a quotation illustrating Roosevelt's use of repetition: "A *nation* intact, a *nation* at peace, a *nation* prosperous, a *nation* clear in its knowledge of what powers it has to serve its own citizens, a *nation* that is in a position . . ., a *nation* which has thus proved . . ."—Gleckler, *op. cit.*, p. 187. (Italics are Miss Gleckler's.)

This critic is audacious enough to rewrite some of the Willkie illustrations to show how they may be better adapted to a specific audience—a procedure which suggests that the critic himself may suggest improvements in order to validate a critical judgment. Obviously he does this gratuitously, as it is not a part of the function of criticism to rewrite speeches.

being compared; and the problem of securing verbatim texts is a dismal business.

III

The conclusion is obvious: Rhetorical criticism is an exacting type of research. The critic must know what is commonly called rhetoric, but to know rhetoric is not enough. He must know historical methods, but to know historical methods is not enough. He must have infinite patience in the search for details, a patience that Job might have envied. He must have the imagination to recreate events and movements long since passed into time. And he must take to heart his primary and inescapable responsibility as a critic: to interpret, to appraise, to evaluate; to say here the speaker missed, here he hit the mark; sometimes to speak with restraint when others applaud, sometimes to bestow praise when others have passed by. The many perils of rhetorical criticism have not deterred scholars of the last twenty years from producing a highly respectable body of writing about speech making, but perhaps they explain why rhetorical criticism in America remained a neglected field for three-quarters of a century after Chauncey A. Goodrich plowed the opening furrow.

BENJAMIN MORGAN PALMER, SOUTHERN DIVINE

WAYNE C. EUBANK AND DALLAS C. DICKEY
Louisiana State University

IN 1934, when the Editorial Board on *The History and Criticism of American Public Address* was consulting historians and authorities in legal biography and homiletics on influential American speakers in their respective fields, the late William E. Dodd, once Professor of History in the University of Chicago but at that time United States Ambassador to Germany, suggested the name of Benjamin Morgan Palmer, saying of him that he was "almost as influential in 1850 as Calhoun."[1]

In respect to chronology, this significant statement concerning Palmer is not quite accurate, for Calhoun had certainly reached his zenith of power by 1850 or earlier, whereas Palmer's influence was probably not great in 1850. His prestige really came to be felt a decade later, and thereafter his contributions to national thought continued until his death, more than sixty years after the passing of Calhoun. Nevertheless, Dodd's statement is highly significant, for Dodd was one of the few historians of his generation who sensed the influence of speechmaking on the flow of history. Furthermore, he had a thorough grasp of Southern history, not to say of American history as a whole, and of the role played by its spokesmen in the middle 1800's.

Benjamin Morgan Palmer is a case in point. Although forgotten today—his very name being unknown to most historians—yet for half a century he was a spokesman of positive influence, before the Civil War and on the issues that grew out of that war.

I

His long and dynamic life span is interesting biography. He was born January 25, 1818, in Charleston, South Carolina, the son of Edward Palmer, a distinguished Presbyterian minister. At the age of twelve he became a student in the Walterboro Academy. Two years later,

[1] William E. Dodd to W. Norwood Brigance, from United States Embassy, Berlin, Germany, September 24, 1934.

in 1832, he went north to enroll in Amherst College. The year 1832 was scarcely an auspicious one for a Southern boy to aspire to a New England education. Since 1820 Southerners in the North had found themselves on the defensive. Now especially, the Nullification conflict of 1832, in which South Carolina took the lead, placed Palmer and his Southern colleagues at Amherst in an embarrassing, if not unhappy, environment. Later, Palmer stated the situation as follows:

> Five of the number hailed from Virginia, four from Georgia, and one poor speckled bird from South Carolina. . . . It was an uncanny time for Southern men to trim their sails for Northern seas. The Nullification storm had just burst over the country, and was not yet appeased. The abolition fanaticism was rising to the height of its frenzy. The elements of conflict were gathering in the theological world, which a little later resulted in the schism rending the Presbyterian Church asunder.[2]

In the classroom and on the campus, Palmer, then as always afterward, upheld the policies of the land of his birth, and this inevitably provoked frequent verbal assaults. The extent of his unhappiness in Abolitionist New England may be discerned from this statement, "I was baited until I was as cross as a brown bear."[3]

As a culmination of the constant attack on his principles, came another difficulty that complicated life at Amherst. Palmer was a member of the Athenian Literary Society, and members of this society were pledged to secrecy of all that took place in their meetings. One of the society practices was the reading by the secretary of anonymous papers dropped into a box at the door of the meeting hall, and on one occasion was read a paper containing some caustic but humorous criticisms of the professors. Henry Ward Beecher, then also a student at Amherst and a member of the Athenian society, betrayed his fellow members by informing the faculty of the incident. At the next meeting a motion was submitted forbidding the continuance of anonymous communications. Palmer moved that the motion be tabled indefinitely, and stated further that the only way the faculty could have known of the paper was through the treachery of some member. He furthermore announced his opinion that it was unworthy of the dignity of the professors to accept perjured testimony as evidence.

Beecher, in turn, passed this incident on to the faculty, whereupon the professors took action to discover the author of the critical essay. Their method was to force each student, one after another, to state his innocence. But some members of the society became indignant at being forced to breach their pledge of allegiance to the society, and Palmer became their spokesman. When he reminded the faculty that he was honor bound to take no part in disclosing the affairs of the society, he was threatened with expulsion. His reply was, "I will take expulsion at your hands rather than trample upon my sense of honor." Because of his youth and display of ethics, and perhaps also because he was scholastically at the head of his class, the faculty did not dismiss him. But "owing to the irritation he had suffered at the hands of the critics of his state and section and to his dislike of the spirit of the college . . . he . . . determined to leave the institution and return to his own people."[4] His leaving was more than a physical departure. It was a mental and emotional separation; and 66 years later when called on to furnish biographical data for the first edition of

[2] Quoted in Thomas Cary Johnson, *Life and Letters of Benjamin Morgan Palmer* (Richmond, Va., 1906), p. 3.

[3] Stated by four unmarried Martin sisters, close friends of Palmer, at McPhersonville, South Carolina, in interview with Wayne C. Eubank, January 30, 1942.

[4] Johnson, *Benjamin Morgan Palmer*, pp. 49-50. See also *Confederate Veteran* (Nashville, 1893-1902), X (August, 1902), 352.

Who's Who in America, he made no reference to having ever attended Amherst.

II

Palmer's formal education, however, did not end with his year and a fraction in Amherst. In 1837, after a period of teaching in the village school at McPhersonville, South Carolina, he entered the University of Georgia. Here, in the Phi Kappa Literary Society, he proved himself to be a ready speaker; and, significantly, among the subjects he discussed were, "Is Nullification of an Unconstitutional Act of Congress by a State the Rightful Remedy?" and "Ought Slavery to Be Abolished in the United States?"[5]

By the time of his graduation from the University of Georgia in 1838 he had turned from an irreligious state of mind and decided to follow the career of his father in the ministry. Consequently, he entered the Theological Seminary of Columbia, South Carolina, and completed his training there in 1841.

His first charge was in Anderson, South Carolina. Late in 1841, he accepted the call of the First Presbyterian Church of Savannah, Georgia. Fifteen months later, in October, 1842, when only 25 years of age, he became the minister of the First Presbyterian Church of Columbia, capital city of South Carolina. Here he remained for 13 years, until 1855, in the meantime declining numerous calls from other churches, both in the North and South. Among these were prominent Presbyterian churches in Baltimore, Charleston, Cincinnati, and Philadelphia.[6]

The most significant part of Palmer's pulpit career was still ahead, however. In 1856 he accepted the invitation of the First Presbyterian Church of New Orleans, and on December 5 preached his "first sermon as Pastor-elect . . . to an overwhelming audience, not less than 1,500 souls."[7] Thus began one of the longest pulpit careers of American divines, surpassing even that of Beecher's in Plymouth Church. It was divided into two periods, the first being brief in comparison with the second. The Civil War, the capture of New Orleans, and a price having been placed upon Palmer's head by the Union Army explains the break. The first period began in 1856 and ended in 1862. The second began in 1865 and ended in 1902 when Palmer, 84 years old and nearly blind, died as the result of injuries sustained when struck by a street car.

III

Palmer—a profoundly religious man whose greatest spiritual services to mankind were performed from his pulpits as minister to successive congregations—illustrates the position of the Southern minister preceding and for many years following the Civil War. He seldom discussed politics from the pulpit, yet as he observed his native South Carolina move step by step from Nullification toward Secession and war in order to preserve rights that were considered no longer safe within the Union, in time he broke his custom of keeping politics out of the pulpit. His Thanksgiving sermon in November, 1860, upon "Slavery a Divine Trust," was an economic, social, and Biblical justification of slavery. The election of Lincoln he saw as the "triumph of a sectional majority" compelling the "doom of our once happy and united Confederacy." Because Palmer saw slavery doomed within the Union, he declared that the South must rally to defend it for "four cardinal reasons, because of duty to *ourselves, to our slaves, to the*

[5] Phi Kappa Society Minutes, Library, University of Georgia, February 11, 1837; April 8, 1837.

[6] Session Records of the Columbia Presbyterian Church, July 15, 1846 and January 31, 1852; Johnson, *Benjamin Morgan Palmer,* p. 147.

[7] Benjamin Morgan Palmer, *Diary,* December 5, 1856, Historical Foundation, Montreat, North Carolina.

world, and to Almighty God." All this Palmer conceived as a trust, which, he said, "we will discharge in the face of the worst peril. Though war be the aggregation of all evils . . . we will not shrink from the baptism of fire."

Palmer set forth constructive proposals on what should be done. From his position as a radical Southerner, he declared:

> Let all the Southern States in solemn council assembled, reclaim the powers they have delegated. Let those conventions be composed of men whose fidelity has been approved . . . support and announce principles which have long been matured. Let those conventions decide firmly and solemnly what they will do with this great trust committed to their hands. Let them pledge each other in sacred covenant, to uphold and perpetuate what they cannot resign without dishonor and palpable ruin. Let them further, take all the necessary steps looking to separate and independent existence; and initiate measures for framing a new and homogenous confederacy. Thus, prepared for every contingency, let the crisis come.

In the conclusion, Palmer referred to the intense religious conviction under which he was speaking, and pledged himself to a full share in the fortunes or fate of the South:

> I have done my duty under as deep a sense of responsibility to God and man as I have ever felt. Under a full conviction that the salvation of the whole country is depending upon the action of the South, I am compelled to deepen the sentiment of resistance in the Southern mind and to strengthen the current now flowing toward a union of the South in defence of her chartered rights. . . .
>
> It only remains to say, that whatever be the fortunes of the South, I accept them for my own. Born upon her soil, of a father thus born before . . . she is in every sense my mother. I shall die upon her bosom—she shall know no peril, but it is my peril—no conflict, but it is my conflict—and no abyss, into which I shall not share her fall. May the Lord God cover her head in this her day of battle.[8]

[8] For a full text of the speech, see *New Orleans Daily Delta*, December 2 and 4, 1860.

Palmer was deeply moved by what he conceived to be an inevitable conflict. Moreover, he spoke at a time when hearers were ready for the action he proposed. The *New Orleans Delta* said of the sermon: "It was an event of the time passing, and a sign of the time at hand. It will be sure to fire the hearts and stir the souls of Southern men wherever read, while through the glowing words God seems to whisper to them of noble deeds."[9]

Six months later, on May 26, he preached another patriotic sermon. This time he had a special audience, the Crescent Rifles, a group of New Orleans soldiers leaving for the battle front. His text was, "Blessed be the Lord, my strength, which teacheth my hands to war and my fingers to fight."[10] Through Biblical allusions and appeals, he attempted to vindicate the South's participation in the conflict, declaring that her position was one of self-defense.

On May 28, 1861, he delivered a third such address, this time outside his pulpit, to the Washington Artillery gathered on the steps of the city hall. Immediately following the address, the troops boarded a train for service in Virginia. According to the *Delta*, there were no less than 5,000 citizens present, in addition to the military. The conclusion of the address is indicative of its tenor:

> It only remains, soldiers, to invoke the blessing of Almighty God upon your honored flag. It waves in brave hands over the gallant defenders of a holy cause. . . . May victory perch upon its staff in the hour of battle,—and peace—an honorable peace—be wrapped within its folds when you shall return. . . . Soldiers, farewell! and may the Lord of Hosts be around about you as a wall of fire, and shield your head in the day of battle.[11]

Palmer in time was compelled to flee

[9] *Ibid.*, December 2, 1860.

[10] A complete version of the sermon is available in *ibid.*, June 2, 1861, and in synopsis form in the *New Orleans Daily Crescent*, May 27, 1861.

[11] *New Orleans Daily Delta*, May 29, 1861.

New Orleans. Because of his activities he had been designated as an "arch rebel," and for his safety left New Orleans even before its capture. Unfortunately, an account of his career during the war is difficult to construct. His movements were shrouded in mystery. It is known, though, that he was with the army of Albert Sidney Johnson on the eve of the Battle of Shiloh, and that "astride a horse, he delivered a thrilling address to a portion of Johnson's army just before it went into battle."[12] In August of 1862 he was with the army of Braxton Bragg in Tennessee, and spoke in Chattanooga on a day set aside by the Confederacy for prayer and fasting.[13] Significantly, too, on March 27, 1863, a day appointed by Jefferson Davis for "fasting, humiliation, and prayer," Palmer delivered a discourse before the legislature of Georgia[14] on "The Rainbow Round the Throne; or Judgment Tempered with Mercy." Still another glimpse of him during the war was when, in June, 1864, at Columbia, South Carolina, he spoke to the "Soldiers of the Legion and Gentlemen of the Army who had been absent from South Carolina for three years."[15] Incomplete though this account is, it suggests the nature of Palmer's activities until the war closed and he was able to return to his congregation in New Orleans.

IV

Palmer was also a Southern spokesman in another realm. By 1860 it was certain that the national Presbyterian Church would be divided. Specifically, the die was cast for Southerners when at the General Assembly held in Philadelphia, May, 1861, resolutions were passed stating, "That the General Assembly, in the spirit of that Christian patriotism which the Scriptures enjoin and which has always characterized this church do hereby acknowledge and declare our obligation to promote and perpetuate, so far as in us lies, the integrity of these United States and to strengthen, uphold, and encourage the Federal Government in the exercise of all its functions under our noble Constitution; and to this Constitution, in all its provisions, requirements and principles, we profess our unabated loyalty."[16]

A schism resulted. In August, 1861, Southern Presbyterian leaders met in Atlanta, Georgia, to execute plans for the establishment of a Southern General Assembly. Out of this meeting grew a second one, held on December 4, 1861, for the purpose of final organization.

Palmer served as temporary moderator of this first Southern Assembly, and preached the opening sermon.[17] His address was entitled, "The Headship of Christ." In no uncertain manner he answered those who in the Philadelphia General Assembly had placed the Church back of the Federal government. His theme was that Christ, not Caesar, was the head of the Church, and that the mission of the Church was strictly spiritual and in no way political. Specifically he indicted the Philadelphia meeting: ". . . it was attempted in the most august court of our Church to place the crown of our Lord upon the head of Caesar—to bind that body, which is Christ's fulness, to the chariot in which Caesar rides." In response to such action by the Northern adherents, Palmer challenged Southern Presbyterian leaders: "And now this Parliament of the Lord's freemen solemnly declares that, by the terms of her great charter, none but Jesus may be the King of Zion. Once more in this

[12] Johnson, *Benjamin Morgan Palmer*, p. 262.
[13] *Ibid.*, p. 265.
[14] *ibid.*, p. 268.
[15] *Ibid.*, p. 273. A copy of the address is available in *The Columbia Daily Southern Guardian*, June 10, 1864.
[16] F. D. Jones and W. H. Mills, *History of the Presbyterian Church in South Carolina since 1850* (Columbia, South Carolina, 1926), p. 80.
[17] *Proceedings of a Convention of Delegates from Various Presbyteries in the Confederate States of America* (Atlanta, 1861), p. 11.

distant age and in these ends of the earth, the Church must declare for the supremacy of her Head and fling out the consecrated ensign with the old inscription, 'For Christ and His Crown.' "[18]

Palmer's invitation to preach this sermon was the product of his leadership among the Southern Presbyterians, and the Southern General Assembly resulted in large measure from his efforts.

V

Even as Palmer had taken a position advocating church separation in 1861, so after the war he was unequivocally opposed to reuniting. In 1870 the General Assembly of the Southern Presbyterian Church met in Louisville, Kentucky. A committee had been sent from the General Assembly of the Northern Presbyterian Church to broach the question of union. Palmer, still leader of the Southern Presbyterians, was named chairman of the committee from the Southern Assembly, and drew up a report in opposition to reunion. Besides some doctrinal differences that seemingly stood in the way, he asserted two other reasons for keeping the bodies separate. One was, "the political utterances of the Northern Assemblies." He stated pointedly that, "We believe it to be solemnly incumbent upon the Northern Presbyterian Church . . . to purge itself of this error, and, by public proclamation of the truth, to place the crown once more upon the head of Jesus Christ as the only King of Zion." The second was that there had been "Injurious accusations preferred against the Southern Presbyterian Church by Northern Assemblies."[19] Under Palmer's leadership the attempt at reunion was thus stopped.

In 1873, the Northern Assembly again attempted to induce Southerners to join. This time Palmer took up his pen to oppose the idea. In four articles in the *Southwestern Presbyterian* he came to the conclusion that, "our objection to this basis of union is today exactly what it was three years ago."[20] Again, the attempt at union was defeated. To the end of his life Palmer continued to oppose union, and was a leading spokesman in opposition. Even today, upwards of half a century since Palmer's death, the two churches have not been united.

VI

From Palmer's activities as a proslavery advocate and opponent of church unity, the impression may be gained that such topics dominated his utterances and inevitably permeated his preaching. Far from it. Instead, he was a doctrinal preacher for 37 years after the Civil War. Such bitter problems as carpetbag rule, Negro suffrage, and even Darwin's theory of evolution seemingly were not touched upon. A safe conclusion is that, aside from his Thanksgiving Sermon of 1860 and the "Crescent Rifles" sermon of 1861, Palmer in the 2,500 Sundays before his congregation kept his pulpit "a sanctuary for God's Word." As evidence of this, in three bound volumes of his sermons issues of politics were avoided in such themes as: "The Church, the Kingdom of the Truth," "Eternal Life, the Gift of God," "Evidences of Conversion," "Fruits of Redemption Certain," "Freedom by Christ," "Love, the Law of the Heart," "Obedience, the Law of the Will," and "The Gospel, the Power of God."[21] The extent to which Palmer preached doctrinal principles almost exclusively was stated as follows by Thomas Cary Johnson, biographer:

> Whatever others might preach, science, sociology, politics, literature, he would preach

[18] The full text of the sermon is available in Johnson, *Benjamin Morgan Palmer*, pp. 247-262.

[19] *Minutes Southern General Assembly, 1870* (Montreat, North Carolina).

[20] Palmer, "The Olive Branch Again," *Southwestern Presbyterian* (New Orleans, 1869-1908, V (June, 1873), 3.

[21] These three volumes are available in the library of Tulane University, New Orleans.

the Gospel, and the Gospel only, from his pulpit. . . . He preached the Westminster interpretation of the Bible, preached it all; the doctrine of the Trinity and the incarnation; the doctrines of sin and grace, the doctrine of the atonement, the doctrines of regeneration and conversion, justification and sanctification. He even preached boldly and frequently on those points of Calvinism which have been so bitterly attacked in every generation, viz.: Total depravity, unconditional election, particular redemption, efficacious grace and perseverance therein unto the end. He was a theological preacher from the very order of his mind. . . . To the minds thus opened he poured in the great central doctrines of Christianity.[22]

Palmer did, however, speak on contemporary problems, particularly those facing the South, but he did this outside the pulpit. After 1870 he was considerably in demand as an occasional speaker. In 1872, for example, he delivered the commencement address at Washington and Lee University, and chose as his theme, "The Present Crisis and Its Issues." In this speech Palmer dwelt on the race question as the most crucial problem facing the South, and declared "that in passing successfully through any crisis a people must possess elasticity enough to adapt themselves to any conditions, and thus to meet the issues of another cycle." Also, as a true Southerner he exhorted the graduating class, "Finally, we must carry over into the future a patriotism that is born of adversity and trial, more intense and purer than in the joyful and prosperous past."[23]

Perhaps the greatest address of Palmer's last years was the Century Sermon, delivered at the request of representative citizens of New Orleans on January 1, 1901. In this discourse, Palmer endeavored to "trace divine purpose through different civilizations and epochs." As the *New Orleans Picayune* described the occasion, "There were Methodists, Baptists, Episcopalians, Jews, German Protestants, Lutherans, merchants, scholars, professional men, representatives of great business and railroad interests, shipping people, strangers to the city, young men and women, old men and women . . . and little children . . . who will see many of the wonderful things which will come to pass in the further march of civilization outlined in the eloquent words of the man who has for forty-four years stood in the pulpit of the First Church and uttered words of wisdom to three generations."[24] The *Times-Democrat* commented, "Looking upon him one felt in all solemnity and with profound pride that a city and country that could produce such a man surely had much energy for good."[25]

So Palmer for upwards of half a century was a religious spokesman for the prevailing opinions of the South. Unlike Beecher and Talmage he never yielded to the lure of the Lyceum or Chatauqua. In the main, like Brooks, he stuck to the pulpit, and was the spiritual counselor and comforter of the hundreds who sat in his church during the rising hope of the young Confederacy, the dark days after its collapse, and the long years thereafter of slow rebuilding. To his congregation he gave his main effort, but his voice reached beyond.

[22] Johnson, *Benjamin Morgan Palmer*, p. 295.
[23] A copy of the address is available in the Tulane University Library.
[24] *New Orleans Daily Picayune*, January 2, 1901. A large picture of Palmer appeared in the center of the page.
[25] *New Orleans Daily Times-Democrat*, January 2, 1901.

WILLIAM ELLERY CHANNING, NEW ENGLAND CONVERSATIONALIST

MARIE HOCHMUTH
University of Illinois

HISTORY, as it has been written, at least until comparatively recently, has given singularly little space to the moralist. And studies in public address, often finding their subjects on the pages of general history, are likely to lean heavily toward the political figure. In both cases, more attention is usually given to the more obvious public efforts of the subject under consideration. Yet, if we are really concerned with the discovery of a "usable past"—if the rhetorician, particularly, is really concerned with discovering what role persuasion has played in the shaping of the American mind and institutions, he will very likely have to give more attention to names that are not so prominently placed on the pages of general history, to offices far removed from the political arena, and to mediums other than the sword, the public address, or even the public press.

I

Although William Ellery Channing, minister of the Federal Street Church in Boston between 1803 and 1842, is little enough known in his capacity as public preacher, moralist, and antislavery pamphleteer, it is probably true that he is much less well-known in his eminently important role as inspiring conversationalist, promoter of group discussion, and wise interpreter, motivator, and counsellor. The average person, starting out to find out for himself how America came to be what it is, is very likely soon to begin feeling that his understanding has been trifled with when he comes upon such observations as that recorded by Theodore Parker in his Journal at the time of Channing's death in 1842:

> I have to-day heard of the death of Dr. Channing. He has fallen in the midst of his usefulness. His faculties grew brighter as age came on him. No man in America has left a sphere of such wide usefulness; no man since Washington has done so much to elevate his country. His life has been spent in the greatest and best works. A great man—and a good man—has gone home from the earth. Why, oh! my God, are so many left, when such are taken? Why could not I have died in his stead?[1]

Or Emerson's observation:

> The death of Dr. Channing at Bennington in Vermont, on the 2d October, is an event of great note to the whole country. The great loss of the community is mitigated by the new interest which intellectual power always acquires by the death of the possessor. Dr. Channing was a man of so much rectitude, and such power to express his sense of right, that his value to this country, of which he was a kind of public *Conscience*, can hardly be overestimated. Not only his merits, but his limitations also, which made all his virtues and talents intelligible and available for the correction and elevation of society, made our Cato dear, and his loss not to be repaired. His interest in the times, and the fidelity and independence, with which, for so many years, he had exercised that censorship on commercial, political, and literary morals, which was the spontaneous dictate of his character, had earned for him an accumulated capital of veneration, which caused his opinion to be waited for in each emergency, as that of the wisest and most upright of judges.[2]

It is true, of course, that recent social historians such as Vernon Lee Parrington,[3]

[1] John Weiss, *Life and Correspondence of Theodore Parker* (1864), I, 183.

[2] *Uncollected Writings by Ralph Waldo Emerson* (1912), p. 113.

[3] Vernon Lee Parrington, "The Romantic Revolution in America," *Main Currents in American Thought* (1927-30), pp. 328-338, and numerous single citations.

Van Wyck Brooks,[4] and Merle Curti[5] have given important aid in recovering Channing's work from the dust, but they have been without much assistance from the specialist whose job it must be to discover not only the thoughts that have become part of American tradition, but the mediums by which men have transmitted themselves, and the sources and degrees of personal power attaching to these men in the times in which they lived. It is the object of this study to recover Channing a little more from the dust, particularly in his capacity as motivating conversationalist, and moral teacher and guide.

II

Channing was born on April 7, 1780, in Newport, Rhode Island, into a home dominated, in his youth, by the political activities of his father who, for many years, served as District Attorney of Rhode Island. His grandfather, and warm friend and counsellor, was William Ellery, a signer of the Declaration. In 1794 he entered Harvard without plan or choice of profession, desiring only to submit himself to the influences of as complete an education as the curriculum of the day provided. And, indeed, it was a meager one. His classmate, Joseph Story, reported:

> In Greek, we studied Xenophon's Anabasis, and a few Books of the Iliad; in Latin, Sallust and a few books of Livy; in Mathematics, Saunderson's Algebra, and a work on Arithmetic; in Natural Philosophy, Enfield's Natural Philosophy and Ferguson's Astronomy; in Rhetoric, an abridgment of Blair's Lectures, and the article on Rhetoric in the 'Preceptor'; in Metaphysics, Watt's Logic, and Locke on the Human Understanding; in History, Millot's Elements; in Theology, Doddridge's Lectures; in grammatical studies, Lowth's Grammar. I believe this is near the whole, if not the whole, course of our systematical studies.[6]

But these were the fiery days of the French Revolution, bringing new social, religious, and political ideologies, and prompting much discussion and debate in the various Literary and Social Societies which existed. The records of four such societies are extant, The Speaking Club, Phi Beta Kappa, Porcellian, and Hasty Pudding. Channing was one of only four boys in a class graduating forty-eight members who belonged to all of these societies.[7] In addition, he was a member of Adelphi, a society largely composed of senior boys who expected to study theology as a profession, whose informal Sunday evening meetings were usually given to dissertations, discourses, and discussions on topics connected with theology and the clerical profession.[8] "His connection with these societies," observed the Hon. D. A. White of Salem, a member of the class of '97, "could not fail to have an important influence on his education—scarcely less, perhaps, taken in all its bearings, than the established course of college studies."[9]

The clearest emphasis that one can discover in Channing's activities while he was a student at Harvard is one showing an interest in expression, or eloquence, and discussion of human affairs. His membership in societies devoted to speaking and discussion attains significance in the light of supplementary reading that he drew from the library, all of the earliest recorded withdrawals, with the exception of an "Essay on Old Age," pertaining to the cultivation of taste and the power of speaking and writing. Among these books one discovers the works of

[4] Van Wyck Brooks, *The Flowering of New England* (New and Revised Ed., 1937), numerous citations.
[5] Merle Curti, *The Growth of American Thought* (1943), numerous citations.
[6] *Memoir of William Ellery Channing with Extracts from His Correspondence and Manuscripts* (Sixth Ed., Boston, 1854), I, 45, 46.
[7] Samuel Eliot Morison, *Three Centuries of Harvard* (Cambridge, 1936), p. 183.
[8] Channing, *Memoir*, I, 57.
[9] *Ibid.*, I, 55.

Cicero, Longinus, Sheridan, Bacon, Walker, and Demosthenes.[10] The treatises of Blair, Campbell, and Lord Kames were, at the time, on the common reserve lists at the library and constituted the ordinary stock of the Harvard student. Throughout life, Channing continued this preoccupation with the cultivation and development of expression, the treatises of Fenelon, particularly, and Whately, receiving enthusiastic acclaim.

Upon leaving Harvard, and much to the surprise of classmates who believed him to be destined for the bar, owing to an established reputation for eloquence, he pursued a course of independent study for the ministry. At the same time, he served as tutor for the children of David Meade Randolph in Richmond, Virginia. In 1801, he returned to Cambridge and, until his ordination on June 1, 1803, he continued to pursue his studies independently, a system wholly contrary to the established practice of submitting one's self to training in technical theology at the hands of an established minister. Channing announced his conception of the ministry in letters to his Harvard classmate, William Smith Shaw, the secretary of John Adams:[11] "Yes, Shaw, I shall be a minister, . . . a reformer of a vicious, and an instructor of an ignorant world,[12] and again,

> I shall now read history very differently from what I used to do. I shall read it as a politician and a moralist. I shall found my opinions of government on what I see to be the effects of different systems, and not on idle speculation.[13]

Robertson's *Charles the Fifth* taught him "the value of *broad views* of human affairs" and led him "to look for the steady causes and tendencies at work among nations."[14] It is quite possible that conceptions of the ministry were aided and implemented by Rousseau, whose *Social Contract* and *Emile* he had read at Harvard,[15] and whose *Eloise* brought from him the remark, "What a writer! Rousseau is the only French author I have ever read, who knows the way to the heart."[16] One can readily discover in Rousseau a principle which governed Channing all his life: "Society must be studied in the individual and the individual in society; those who desire to treat politics and morals apart from one another will never understand either."[17]

III

He entered the ministry with several predominant beliefs: 1) that man is infinitely perfectible; 2) that in man there is a "moral faculty" capable of being unfolded, much as the intellectual capacities of the individual are capable of development; 3) that the true end of religion and government is virtue, which will make men free and release all their energies; 4) that all men must be made aware of duties and obligations to each other, to the community, and to the nation; and 5) that it is the business of the moral teacher to assist in the development and direction of all the capacities of human nature and to turn all things to the greatest good for the greatest number. In arriving at these beliefs, he had been mightily assisted by the Roman moralists whom he had read avidly, by the Scottish moralists and philosophers, and by the whole group of English and French ideologues who had furnished

[10] *Library Minute Book, Sophomores from Commencement 1795.* Harvard University Archives. Channing's supplementary reading record is available for the years 1795-98.

[11] See Joseph B. Felt, *Memorials of William Smith Shaw* (Boston, 1852), for Channing-Shaw Correspondence; also, Channing, *Memoir* I.

[12] Letter of Channing to William Smith Shaw, October 1798, quoted in Channing, *Memoir*, I, 78.

[13] Letter of Channing to Shaw, February 26, 1799, quoted in Channing, *Memoir* I, 100 and excerpts in Felt, *op. cit.*, p. 43.

[14] *Channing, Memoir*, I, 100.

[15] *Juniors' Library Account Book—From Commencement 1796.* Harvard University Archives.

[16] Channing, *Memoir*, I, 102.

[17] Romain Rolland, *The Living Thoughts of Rousseau*, New York, 1939, pp. 95, 96.

ammunition for the rise of the common man during and following the French Revolution: Voltaire, Rousseau, William Godwin, Mary Wollstonecraft, Thomas Paine, believers in equality and the rights of man, in education and the sovereignty of reason. Channing was clearly a man of the New Testament, believing much more in the spirit than in the letter of Christian Revelation as a guide to conduct. His lifelong interest and primary concern was to make human beings investigate for themselves, weigh evidences, exercise reason, and develop themselves individually to the maximum of their capacities, and to feel a moral, civic, and social responsibility for progress.

Emerson's description of the times up to 1820 gives some hint of what a young man, bent upon moving the New England mind, might have had to contend with:

> To write a history of Massachusetts, I confess, is not inviting to an expansive thinker. . . . Since, from 1790 to 1820, there was not a book, a speech, a conversation, or a thought, in the State. About 1820, the Channing, Webster, and Everett era begun, and we have been bookish and poetical and cogitative since.[18]

"I wish I could make you feel that no power is more noble than the power of swaying the mind, and impressing the heart,"[19] wrote Channing to his schoolmistress friend, Eloise Payne, the sister of the early American dramatist and actor, John Howard Payne. Immediately upon his ascendancy to the ministry he began to put his power of persuasion into effect in a variety of ways, other than in public ministrations from the pulpit.

One of his first gestures upon becoming pastor at the Federal Street Church was to organize the women of his parish for religious instruction and "for awakening a just comprehension of religious duty."[20] For many years he held these discussion meetings for women at the home of Mrs. Catherine Codman, one of his parishioners. According to Mrs. George Lee, one of the participants in these conversation meetings, there were usually fifty or more present, largely members of the Federal Street Congregation, "though others often requested the privilege of attending."[21] Many years later, when Froebelian theory struck American education, it was not unusual to hear Boston grandmothers, accustomed to attending Channing's meetings, remark:

> But this is nothing new; more than fifty years ago Dr. Channing taught us to *live with* our children. . . . Indeed he, only in more poetic Christian phrase than the modern scientist, declared the child to be the original man. . . .[22]

There were not a few, like the mother of Elizabeth Peabody, who thought that he had "genius to reach children."[23] In these meetings, he sought to awaken mothers to a recognition of their responsibility to their offspring, and their influence upon them.

IV

In 1817, Channing approached the members of his congregation in effort to secure a vestry-hall, to serve as a place for catechizing and instructing the children, to serve as a place for meetings of a singing-school, a charity school, a Sunday school, to provide a place for a collection of books, and in order that he might have a more satisfactory meeting-place for the women's discussions.[24] He secured the building in 1818 and in dedicating it, threw out the hint that "nothing would gratify me more than to meet

[18] *Journals of Ralph Waldo Emerson* (Boston, 1912), VIII, 339.
[19] *Letter of Channing to Eloise Payne*, August 21, 1811. MSS in American Unitarian Historical Society Library.
[20] Channing, *Memoir*, II, 144.
[21] *Ibid.*, II, 145.
[22] Elizabeth Peabody, *Reminiscences of Rev. Wm. Ellery Channing, D. D.* (Boston, 1880), p.92.
[23] *Ibid.*, p. 12.
[24] Channing, *Memoir*, II, 139-142.

occasionally the young men for free conversation, or more regular instruction, on the subject of religion."[25] At least by 1822, in response to his constant urging and goading, the "Wednesday Evening Association," often called "the mother of so many wise and generous plans of moral and social improvement," began to function, holding its first meeting at Channing's home in February of that year.[26] Samuel J. May, later antislavery leader, and in 1822 serving temporarily as Channing's assistant at Federal Street, reports attending these meetings which "often called from the Doctor his happiest and most precious utterances."[27] During this year, the subject of the theater and public amusements was for many weeks under discussion, and the question was raised "whether popular lectures upon literary and scientific subjects might not be made very attractive, as well as useful, to very many who frequented the theatre and balls for want of some better occasions for social enjoyment."[28] Mr. May has observed, "If I am not mistaken, this was one of the earliest movements that led to the institution of courses of public lectures—the Lyceum and the Lowell Institute."[29] On the surface, this deduction appears to give too much credit to the efforts and energies of one man, or a small group of men, and smacks of the kind of hero-worship that sought to make "Parson Channing" governor of Massachusetts in 1820.[30] It attains significance by virtue of the fact that Channing was "chosen unanimously" on the School Committee at a Boston town-meeting in 1808,[31] that in 1813 he became a member of the Corporation of Harvard University,[32] and that he was constantly pressing for better and more extensive means of education for indigent boys, for tradesmen and mechanics, for those interested in commercial pursuits—all those, either without means or dubious about the benefits of the increasingly scholarly curriculum at Harvard. Channing was forever slipping recommendations to John Kirkland, President of Harvard, exchanging ideas with George Ticknor, the Smith Professor of Belles-Lettres, talking things over with Jonathan Phillips, his former classmate and wealthy benefactor of Boston schools, and watching the half-hearted interest of the Massachusetts legislature in regard to education. "The strongest argument for education is found in the nobleness of the human faculties," he had argued in 1817, "and the poor bring with them into being the same faculties with the opulent. Nature knows none of our arbitrary distinctions."[33] The "Wednesday Evening Association," often referred to as the "Beneficent Association," was composed of Bostonians interested: 1) in extending the knowledge of true religion and advancing its practical influence; 2) in promoting any plans of a public nature for improving the condition of society; and 3) in producing unity of purpose and effort among Unitarian Christians.[34] The impulse emanating from Federal Street connects quite easily with the development of the public lecture and the American Lyceum. In 1826, when the *American Journal of Education* carried announcements and reports of projected schemes for adult education,[35] the editor, William Russell, was constantly in touch with Channing and with the

[25] Excerpts from the Address at the Dedication of the Berry Street Vestry, in Channing, *Memoir*, II, 143, 144.
[26] *Ibid.*, III, 16, 17.
[27] *Memoir of Samuel Joseph May* (Boston, 1876), p. 74.
[28] *Ibid.*, p. 74.
[29] *Ibid.*, pp. 74, 75.
[30] *Boston Town Records, 1814-1822* (Boston, 1906), p. 139.
[31] *Boston Town Records, 1796-1813* (Boston, 1905), p. 229.
[32] William Henry Channing, *The Life of William Ellery Channing, D. D.* (Boston, 1880), p. 293.
[33] "Address before the Association for the Education of Indigent Boys," *Memoir*, II, 69, 70.
[34] *Ibid.*, III, 17.
[35] *American Journal of Education*, Vol. I, No. 10 (October, 1826) pp. 594-97.

whole group of awakened Bostonians. Channing's friend, Jonathan Phillips, a contributor to the magazine, had for several years been a trustee of the Boston Monitorial School.[36] Josiah Holbrook, who went from Connecticut to Boston to organize the American Lyceum, was the warm friend of Samuel May, whose enthusiasm for Channing had been awakened early in the twenties. At 12 Newell Street, where Holbrook was busy writing the prospectus for the American Lyceum, he was being ably assisted by Bronson Alcott, who had gone to Boston all on fire to be near the stimulating influence of Channing.[37]

Shortly after the "Wednesday Evening Association" began to function, under the influence of Channing, there was formed on June 6, 1824, the "Association of the Members of the Federal Street Society for Benevolent Purposes," an association which continued for ten years and discussed various charitable enterprises, Sunday Schools, missions, the Ministry-at-large, and means of supporting students at the Divinity School.[38]

In 1826, in order to discuss methods of instruction for the Sunday School at Federal Street, Channing organized the teachers and met with them fortnightly. But, as always, strictly religious teaching yielded to the larger question of general educational methods, with such men as George Ticknor, the Harvard scholar; Charles Follen, the newly arrived German exile who was later to become professor of German language at Harvard; Jonathan Phillips, a Boston philanthropist; William Russell, the elocutionist; Judge John Davis; members of the Sedgewick family; and women like Elizabeth Peabody, a Boston teacher; several of the Cabots; and numerous others participating in discussions. Joining this group, meeting under the name of "The Society for Education," in 1827, was Channing's friend Joseph Tuckerman who had responded to Channing's appeal before the "Beneficent Association" on May 17, 1826, on "the expediency and practicability of procuring for the poor of the city a preacher, who should associate with himself as instructors intelligent laymen . . ."[39] With Tuckerman's entry the subject of the education of children "yielded to that which the several classes of adult society give each other."[40] According to a recent study, "Some of Channing's finest social service sermons were preached not from the Federal Street pulpit but from his desk in his communications to his field marshall, Joseph Tuckerman."[41] The importance of this organization cannot be overestimated in its efforts to arouse Boston to cogitate on a multitude of educational, social, political, and religious questions. Russell with his training in Scottish universities, Follen with his training and teaching in German and Swiss universities, Ticknor with his interest in developing the Harvard curriculum, Jonathan Phillips, once an atheist who had returned to faith by reading Bacon's *Novum organum* at the library of the University of Paris, gaining "the clew to self-education,"[42] Channing's brothers Walter and Edward, one trained in medicine and the other Harvard Professor of Rhetoric, and Channing, the inveterate reader of Plato, who had visited Europe in 1822 and received new stimulation from Coleridge and Wordsworth, were, indeed, an alertly alive group. It is not at all unusual to be able to trace the progress of opinions

[36] "Report of Trustees," *American Journal of Education*, Vol. I, No. 1 (January, 1826) p. 31.

[37] Odell Shepard, *Pedlar's Progress, The Life of Bronson Alcott* (Boston, 1938), p. 112 ff.

[38] Channing, *Memoir*, III, 16.

[39] *Ibid.*, III, 17. See, also, Peabody, *op. cit.* and *The Works of Charles Follen, with a Memoir of His Life*, (Boston, 1842), Vol. I for reports of meetings.

[40] Peabody, *op. cit.*, p. 268.

[41] Daniel T. McColgan, *Joseph Tuckerman, Pioneer in American Social Work* (Washington. D.C., 1940), p. 239.

[42] Peabody, *op. cit.*, p. 254.

that were voiced in these meetings, through the streets of Boston as participants in discussion returned home, and to find them emerging in various parts of the city weeks later, with new groups taking their stand with one or another of the interlocutors.[43]

V

Thought and speculation became habitual among a group of kindred spirits in Boston in the twenties and thirties. There were more and more readers of Plato, Kant, Coleridge, Wordsworth, and Carlyle, a sign of spiritual and romantic reaction to the sensational philosophy of John Locke which had for years dominated New England. This was a signal for Channing to suggest a new association, this time one for "mutual inquiry."[44] In response to the suggestion, in 1836, The Symposium, more popularly known as The Transcendental Club, began to meet. Idealistic all, Margaret Fuller, George Ripley, Dr. Convers Francis, Theodore Parker, Frederick Hedge, Orestes Brownson, James Freeman Clarke, W. H. Channing, Bronson Alcott, Emerson, and Channing met at each other's houses to discuss philosophical, religious, and literary questions.[45] Channing, who had set the club into motion, did not always attend the meetings. To a certain extent they were dominated by Bronson Alcott who, though a disciple of Channing, was more extreme in his inclination to make individual experience the test of all verity.

Before this group began to function, differences between Alcott and Channing were apparent, for on January 2, 1835, Alcott came away from a private conversation with Channing, disgruntled because Channing had insisted that "We cannot conceive of the dignity and destiny of man without the lights of history," when, as Alcott thought, "he should have the facts in his own mind."[46] In 1837, he again clashed with Channing who had insisted on "demonstrations" where "self-affirmation declares the truth to a nature in harmony with itself."[47] Alcott wrote in his Diary, "He distrusts me. . . . He is a disciple of the understanding, despite his professed reverence for the reason and spirit. He is not disenthralled from the slavery of sense and the visible."[48]

It is very likely that Channing was not finding out "how far minds can meet," for he set out on new tracks in 1840. He took counsel with George Ripley on the question "whether it were possible to bring cultivated, thoughtful people together, and make society that deserved the name."[49] He had earlier talked with Dr. John Collins Warren about such a project and solicited his aid in making an experiment. Channing repaired to Dr. Warren's house on an appointed evening "with large thoughts which he wished to open," finding a "well-chosen assembly of gentlemen variously distinguished."[50] When the whole company streamed in to an oyster supper, crowned with excellent wines, the "first attempt to establish aesthetic society in Boston"[51] came to an abrupt end, for the Doctor could not have thought such indulgence conducive to serious discussion. However, he again approached Mr. and Mrs. Ripley who, with some care, invited a limited number of people, among whom

[43] See discussion of "gratitude," beginning November 27, 1827, at Channing's and emerging, after much discussion, elsewhere, December 20, 1827, in *The Works of Charles Follen, with a Memoir of His Life*, I, 194-221 *passim*.

[44] Odell Shepard, *op. cit.*, p. 247.

[45] "Life and Letters in New England," *Lectures and Biographical Sketches by Ralph Waldo Emerson* (Boston and New York, 1889), pp. 264, 265.

[46] *The Journals of Bronson Alcott* (Sel. and Ed. by Odell Shepard, Boston, 1938), p. 50.

[47] *Ibid.*, p. 86.

[48] *Ibid.*, p. 86.

[49] "Life and Letters in New England," *op. cit.*, p. 264.

[50] *Ibid.*, p. 264.

[51] *Ibid.*, p. 264.

Emerson had "the honor to be present."[52] Channing had only two more years to live and, until the end, he nudged, goaded, and hinted whenever he came into contact with a receptive mind. He never urged or forced, but trusted that hints might fall on fertile soil and set minds into operation, for "So Nature teaches,"[53] he had observed.

Apart from his larger activities with groups, he had his own private little circle, often humorously referred to as "Club of the Jacobins." Jonathan Phillips, Joseph Tuckerman, Charles Follen, Theodore Parker were privileged members. In this intimate circle were hatched many of the liberalizing ideas of the early nineteenth century, the obligations of the rich to the poor, society's responsibility for crime, the rehabilitation of prisoners, free trade, mediation to settle international disputes, the elevation of the working class, the tyranny of mobs and public opinion, the absolute freedom and equality of all men under a common Father. Parker observed in 1839: "If Dr. Channing could be ground over again, and come out a young man of five-and-twenty . . . hold the same religious, philosophical, political, and social opinions as now . . . he could not find a place for the sole of his foot in Boston, though half-a-dozen pulpits were vacant—not he."[54]

He passed easily from discussing theology and education with young ministers and teachers, to discussions of better housing for the poor with Joseph Tuckerman, or the state of literature with Ticknor, Edward T. Channing, or the Transcendentalists, or Burke's revolutionary principle with Charles Follen, or slavery with John Quincy Adams, Theodore Parker, Whittier, Lydia Maria Child and other reformers, or war and capital punishment with Noah Worcester, or prison reform with Dorothea Dix. He was constantly in touch with the most vigorous minds that emerged in the early nineteenth century.

VI

Conversation was not with Channing an exercise in relaxation. Just as preaching was the "great action" of his life, conversation was its "ordinary action." In both cases, action was his primary end and object. He wrote no treatises on conversation; however, multitudes of observations on the theory, purposes, and manner of conversation are scattered through his *Works, Memoir, Notebook,* and uncollected manuscripts. Several principles seem to have guided him in his motives and methods: 1) "Just in proportion as men advance in civilization they give more time to conversation";[55] 2) "It is very important that in conversation we have a pervading sense of the dignity of the being with whom we converse";[56] 3) "Converse so that you may draw largely upon other minds";[57] 4) "Studied conversation is most tedious and defeats all its ends. We want in conversation that the heart should flow out. We cannot every moment pronounce maxims";[58] 5) "Never talk for show. This rule will almost cut up conversation by the root—but no matter";[59] 6) "On common topics we should present the best thoughts which immediately occur to us, in the best language which immediately offers. Simplicity, sincerity, and truth will often be the only commendable qualities";[60] 7) "Let me in conversation avoid finding fault, satire, severity; let me express the spirit and power, rather than the speculations, of divinity; let me communicate liberally whatever knowledge I

[52] "Life and Letters in New England," *op. cit.*, p. 264.
[53] Channing, *Life*, p. 694.
[54] John Weiss, *op. cit.*, I, 109.

[55] *Dr. Channing's Note-Book* (Sel. by his granddaughter, Grace Ellery Channing, Boston, 1887), p. 69.
[56] *Ibid.*, p. 69.
[57] *Ibid.*, p. 67.
[58] *Ibid.*, p. 68.
[59] *Ibid.*, p. 67.
[60] *Ibid.*, p. 68.

acquire, and raise our social intercourse";[61] 8) "It should always be one end to benefit those we converse with. If we cannot give much, give little";[62] 9) "Let your life fortify your conversation."[63]

His conversation meetings were not merely formless gatherings for the spontaneous effusion of ignorance or hearsay. It is quite possible to discover topics as succinctly stated as, "Shall Congress increase the duties on foreign manufactures, in order to support domestic factories?"[64] Instructions for future discussions were often as carefully given as the following: "Let Conversion be our subject, and let us collect from our experience and observation as many *instances* as we are able. Facts will serve to develop this interesting subject, if they can be obtained; though, from their nature, it is difficult to obtain them I know."[65] Often whole meetings were spent in obtaining definitions of terms, for Channing had given himself scholastic discipline in his Harvard days and during the early years of his ministry. In the meetings of "The Society for Education" he habitually asked that the participants write out questions previous to the meetings.

Channing as a conversationalist in America shares the reputation that Coleridge enjoyed in England. Indeed, Coleridge, his great British compeer, whom he visited in 1822, once paid tribute to this American conversationalist by remarking to Washington Allston that he "had seldom met with a person so interesting in conversation as Mr. Channing."[66] One frequently discovers critical observations to the effect that "His talk was as remarkable as his preaching."[67] In those gatherings of friends and acquaintances, remarks A. B. Muzzey,

> . . . where topics of social interest were discussed, however wise the remarks of others, he usually had a wisdom beyond theirs. Men of large thought and liberal culture, and from various callings and professions might be present, and say excellent things. And yet you saw by the doubts he suggested, the limits he set up, his hard questions, his sharp criticisms and bold objections, that he saw depths of the subject below your own best vision. He might at last come to acquiesce in your opinion; but it would be only after a delay, and after a persistence and firmness of opposition, which, gentle and kind as his manner always was, promised you, for long reaches, anything but a final assent.[68]

And James Freeman Clarke observed:

> . . . his conversation revolves so steadily around the axis of mighty truths, and turns always upward, lifting us all along. Hopes and prayers for a better time, anxious inquiries into the spiritual state of all men and all societies, broad and deep surveys of the questions most vital to human interests, —such are the regular themes of his discourse. And ever and anon there comes an unlooked-for playfulness into his manner, which is unspeakably graceful and winning.[69]

VII

The influence Channing brought to bear upon society through conversation was in no sense limited to New England or to America. His writings had established his reputation in Europe as a great humanitarian, liberal reformer, and man of letters. In the first half of the nineteenth century, he was one of three private citizens whose writings attained wide circulation in Europe, the other two being Washington Irving and

[61] Channing, *Memoir*, I, 198.
[62] *Dr. Channing's Note-Book*, p. 68.
[63] *Ibid.*, p. 69.
[64] *The Works of Charles Follen, with a Memoir of His Life*, I, 204.
[65] Peabody, *op. cit.*, p. 226.
[66] *Ibid.*, p. 76.
[67] J. H. Morison, "William Ellery Channing," *Unitarian Review*, Vol. XIII, No. 4, p. 343.
[68] "Personal Recollections, with Notices, of Rev. Dr. Channing," *Unitarian Review*, Vol. III, No. 5, pp. 484, 485.
[69] Letter of James Freeman Clarke to A. H., December 29, 1838, quoted in James Freeman Clarke, *Autobiography, Diary and Correspondence* (Ed. by Edward Everett Hale, Boston and New York, 1891), p. 124.

James Fenimore Cooper.[70] In the early nineteenth century when England, particularly, was in the habit of thinking that men born in republics were a pack of ruffians and of asking the question "Who ever reads an American book?" there were not a few who believed Channing to be the "finest writer of the age."[71] European travelers in America invariably sought him out to discuss the state of religion, manners, politics, and many questions pertaining to the conditions and relations of human nature. "I thought of the lettered Pliny and his elegant villa at Laurentinum," observed one of them as he walked with Channing in the garden, but "A nobler than Pliny was here. . . ."[72] In 1831, Tocqueville, the French observer of American Democracy, visited him and conversed with him on the relationship of religion to Democracy.[73] In 1842, Charles Dickens hastened to converse with him and to pay him tribute for his "bold philanthropy."[74] The services that Channing rendered in improving international relations at a time when they were constantly straining cannot be overestimated. Just as through his writings he extended the knowledge of the functions of American Democracy and reforms aimed at freedom, so in conversation with European travelers he corrected impressions and exhibited faith in the activities of free men. Europeans were often too eager to shed a false tear over the raucousness and crudity of manners in the upstart nation. In Channing they found a cultivation inferior to few, combined with faith in the triumph of free institutions and often, as a result, joined in the general tribute to men born in Republics.

VIII

Channing was a man possessing "intellectual enthusiasm"[75] and having wide acquaintance with new light being shed on social, moral, and political questions. But aside from the comprehensiveness of his views on a multitude of subjects, that made him a valuable inquirer, informant, and "public Conscience" there was in him the motivating power that attaches itself to ethical character. He is undoubtedly one of the clearest examples in the whole of rhetorical tradition of "the good man, skilled in speaking." To the German exile, Charles Follen, after his first seven years of residence in America, Channing was one "of but two eminent men, who, for the sake of gaining the cooperation of others for one good object, will not at least connive at their alliance with the evil in some other shape."[76] It was not the austere goodness of the saint, but the earnest goodness of a man concerned with spiritual and social progress, who believed in the motivating possibilities resident in great example. To his Harvard classmates, he had been "an amiable and almost divine fellow";[77] to his elder brother, Francis, he was "a bright light in the world" who "illumines," "animates," and "points the way."[78] "Nowhere," could he discern "So pure a mind, united with so noble a spirit, and such exquisite feelings."[79] To Bronson Alcott, he was the "sun which beams in its full meridian splendour" upon Boston, "quickening and invigorating the souls which dwell within it."[80]

[70] Clarence Gohdes, *American Literature in 19th-Century England* (1944), p. 138; Harold Mantz, *French Criticism of American Literature Before 1850* (1917), p. 134; William Charvat, *The Origins of American Critical Thought, 1810-1835* (Philadelphia, 1936), pp. 200, 201.

[71] *Frazer's Magazine*, Vol. XVII, No. CI (May, 1838), p. 627. For similar reports of European regard, see *Life, Letters, and Journals of George Ticknor* (Boston, 1876), II, 150.

[72] *Christian Register*, Vol. XXII, No. 18 (May 6, 1843), p. 72, col. 2, reprinted from the Liverpool *Albion* and the *Boston Daily Advertiser*.

[73] George Wilson Pierson, *Tocqueville and Beaumont in America* (1938), pp. 421-423.

[74] Charles Dickens, *American Notes* (1842), p.13.

[75] Channing, *Memoir*, I, 50.

[76] *The Works of Charles Follen, with a Memoir of His Life*, I, 337.

[77] Channing, *Memoir*, I, 79, 80.

[78] *Ibid.*, I, 159.

[79] *Ibid.*, I, 79, 80.

[80] *The Journals of Bronson Alcott*, p. 15.

His character in conversation, as in all public undertakings, could be trusted, and the many who conferred with him, young ministers, reformers, politicians, and the oppressed, "went away fed, satisfied."[81]

Literally hundreds of Americans and Europeans sought out this man of "rare simplicity and grandeur of perception," this "pure idealist" who "read Plato as an equal" and "inspired his companions only in proportion as they were intellectual"[82] to find out what he thought about the tendencies, the capacities, the duties, the rights, and the destiny of human nature. "How I wish I knew what Dr. Channing would think!"[83] exclaimed Hannah Adams, the New England historian, searching her own conscience about the matter of publishing an autobiography while she lived. To Elizabeth Peabody, Channing's emanuensis, he seemed "a fixed centre, around which was much revolution of thought in Massachusetts."[84] Many years after his death in 1842, Emerson found in his life a vindication "of the power of the American race to produce greatness."[85]

[81] Moncure Daniel Conway, *Emerson at Home and Abroad* (Boston 1882), p. 56.
[82] "Life and Letters in New England," *op. cit.*, p. 265.
[83] Peabody, *op. cit.*, p. 304.
[84] *Ibid.*, Preface, iii.
[85] "Life and Letters in New England," *op. cit.*, p. 264.

THE SPEECH PROFESSION JILTS RADIO

F. L. WHAN
University of Wichita

FROM the time of Aristotle's classic observations on the importance of audience analysis, speech authors have copied his arm-chair philosophy. Hardly an author has failed to call attention to the importance of the audience in the speech situation; and nearly all have rewritten the vague and helpless directives of the classical writers. Here and there, isolated psychologists and speech men have carried on scientific research, for the most part using controlled groups of schoolroom audiences. Their findings usually have reinforced the observation that student audiences are *conditioned*—conditioned by necessity of the classroom. They seem conditioned by years of practice to glean the fundamental ideas from any speech, no matter how dry or disorganized, and to retain these ideas long enough to pass tests. Hence, many believe that little of value can be learned from a study of effects of different techniques on audiences composed of students.

With the advent of radio, however, speech teachers were offered a new medium—a new method of reaching large groups of people. It now became possible with relatively little expense to test effectiveness of various types of speech devices on different classes and types of individuals. Not counting "FM," twenty-four educational institutions own and operate radio stations; hundreds of others broadcast free of charge over commercial outlets. Most of the large graduate speech schools and departments have this equipment available to them. We can only wonder that speech educators in general, and those majoring in rhetoric in particular, have not taken advantage of radio to test for once and all the philosophies on which they have hopefully operated for the past 23 centuries. So far, the amount of research carried on by speech departments via radio on audience analysis is pitifully small, inadequate, and lacking in imagination.

II

No attempt will be made in this paper to report on the research in speech techniques so far completed. The whole is so meager as to be of severest condemnation to graduate schools of speech. Franklin K. Knower, in reporting the individual theses from 1902-1941, recorded 241 Ph.D. and 3,652 M.A. degrees issued by speech departments. Of this vast number so few theses dealt with radio or with audience reaction to speech devices, that Knower did not use such classifications in organizing theses under general heads. Assuming that original research is required for the doctorate, a study of the 241 titles shows only three dealing with audience, and only two others dealing with audience and radio. Yet nearly all of the research for these degrees was done during the years of radio availability. The other 237 subjects ranged from studies of vibrato and individual speech sounds to analyses of "rhetorical technique" of the speakers of an entire period. Most of those dealing with rhetoric have been historical in nature, analyzing printed speeches handed down by some successful speaker of the past. They run on the assumption that, in the light of Aristotle's observations, arm-chair philosophy can analyze the reasons for effectiveness from the printed page.

We find that a successful speaker of the past, among other things, used twenty rhetorical questions. We assume that those questions helped cause his effectiveness, because Aristotle reminisced 23 centuries ago that rhetorical questions are effective devices, . . . when used correctly. However, we have never tried to discover whether correct use differs with different types and classes of people.

Although historical investigation and study of individual sounds is legitimate research, have we not overstressed the less important and understressed the very foundation of effectiveness? Have we not failed to take advantage of the golden opportunity radio offers to discover at long last, scientifically, the strength and weaknesses of the devices of speech with different classes of listeners?

In script-writing courses, public-speaking courses, and debate and discussion courses, we boldly and confidently teach hopeful students to use this or that device because we have been told or we have read that generally speaking the device is a good one to use. Most of us who teach have had the embarrassing experience of being asked by some bright student, "Very well, I've analyzed my audience. Now what? Which devices fit the different elements? How does a speech to young farm women differ from one made to airplane mechanics over 45 years of age, when the subject is on life insurance?" Most of us fall back on the time honored explanation that "their *interests* will differ, different *clearness devices* are needed," and so on. But the questioning persists, *"How* do they differ? What shall I use to interest the one, and what shall I do to interest the other?" Our answer is to speak in general terms of word pictures, of humor, of startling statement, and of comparison. But, nowhere in our literature can we find *what to do* for specific types of audiences after they have been analyzed by the prospective speaker. Our teaching must content itself with the dictate, "Reason out what will be effective, and which of the interest devices will catch and hold this particular audience."

III

The importance of selection of correct devices for specific audiences is strikingly proved by radio. During the past four years the Department of Speech in the University of Wichita has been experimenting with radio research. In four

years' time our questionnaires have reached 3,500 homes by mail, 16,000 other questionnaires have been carried home and returned by school children, and 63,000 other homes have been visited by our interviewers. These 82,500 homes were located in exact proportion to population in each of the 280 counties of three Midwestern states—and in exact relation to the division of population within each county in cities, villages and on farms. The evidence thus gathered has been published and will not be reviewed here. However, one major element of interest to speech and radio teachers stands out. Replies from these 82,500 homes prove that audience differences are so vital that all other problems of speech preparation shrink to insignificance in comparison.

For example, consider the all important problem of *holding interest*. Radio offers an excellent opportunity to test the effectiveness of the different interest devices on different types of people. Without interest, no radio audience exists. Radio broadcasters are well aware of this fact and annually spend millions in attempting to interest greater numbers of people. They have searched the literature, hired the best writers and directors and voices their money could buy. They annually spend other hundreds of thousands of dollars to discover who listens to which program. If the generalizations laid down by speech teachers are all that is needed to get and hold interest, we can expect to find similarly designed programs to appeal to similar percentages of different classes of people. But what does the evidence show?

IV

First of all, it substantiates Aristotle's general conclusion that audiences differ according to age, educational background, occupation, and sex. But, consider the most universally interesting of all types of programs, those featuring comedians. It is easy to discover that place of residence, educational background, and sex play no significant part in determining an individual's liking for comedian programs; between 70 and 75 per cent of all types like comedians. Only in the case of age do we find significant differences, when 16 per cent greater proportion of adults under 36 years of age select comedian programs than do adults over 50 years of age. However, allowing for such differences as do exist, individual comedians continued to appeal to widely different types of people.

Half again as great a proportion of men as women like *Bob Burns* and *Duffy's*, although more women than men like the *Burns and Allen* program.

Twice as many farm as city people like *Bob Burns*, but three and one-half times as many of the city people like *Fred Allen*, and more than four times as many of the city people like *Duffy's*.

About a third more adults under 35 years of age like *Bob Hope, Red Skelton*, and *Duffy's;* but a third more of those over 50 years of age like *Fibber McGee, Gildersleeve, Bob Burns*, and *Fred Allen*.

Two-thirds again as great a percentage of college-educated people as those with grade-school educations like *Charley McCarthy*, but half again as many of those with grade-school education like *Gildersleeve, Burns and Allen, Eddie Cantor* and *Bob Burns*.

Thus, when considering a universally appealing type of program, based on humor, individual classes and types of people differ radically in their liking for different programs within the type. What is it about the individual comedians or their subject matter which appeals to such strikingly different percentages of farm and city people, of men and women, of old and young, of educated and uneducated? The problem not only

is of vital concern to the comedians; it is a challenge to speech research. It is not enough to say that "humor is an excellent interest device"; different types of humor interest different classes of people. Research must tell us more specifically *what* catches the fancy of the different types.

V

When dealing with a less universally interesting program type, the quality of appeal of different programs to different classes of people becomes even more striking. Each difference in appeal found in generally similar programs should challenge the speech investigator to fresh efforts.

After making allowances for general differences in liking for "complete drama programs," why does *The Aldrich Family* interest one-fourth more men than women, although *One Man's Family* interests one-third more women than men?

Why does *Screen Guild* interest one-fourth more women, while *First Nighter* interests an equal proportion of both sexes?

Or, from the standpoint of residence, when *One Man's Family* interests one-eighth more city people, why does *The Aldrich Family* interest two and one-fourth times the proportion of farmers? *Lights Out* interest about one-half again greater proportions of city than farm listeners, but *Inner Sanctum* interests three times its correct[1] proportion of city people.

From the standpoint of age, *First Nighter* interests an equal number of young and old, but *Screen Guild* interests half again as great a proportion under 35 years of age as it does those over 50, and *Dr. Christian* interests half-again as great a proportion of those over 50.

One Man's Family interests more college and grade educated adults, but *The Aldrich Family* interests three-fourths again its expected proportion of those with nothing but grade school education.

Again, allowing for differences to be found normally in the case of serial drama or soap operas, what causes similar programs to appeal to different proportions of the various classes of listeners?

Why does *Judy and Jane* draw twice its normal proportion of farm listeners, although *Vic and Sade* interests half-again its proportion of city audience? Why does *Lonely Woman* interest one-sixth more city than farm listeners, if *Portia Faces Life* attracts three and one-fourth times its proportion of those from farms, and *When a Girl Marries* draws four times its farm percentage?

Light of the World interests half again its proportion of city people, but *Guiding Light* draws half-again *its* proportion of farm listeners.

Vic and Sade interests two-thirds greater proportion of college educated than it does of grade school educated listeners, but *Judy and Jane* draw two and three-fourths times their proportion to those educated by grade school only, and *Stella Dallas* draws three times its proportion of this type of audience.

Making allowances for differences in general interest for classical music, why does the *Telephone Hour* draw an equal number of men and women, although *The Family Hour* (another serious music program) appeals to nearly three times its proportion of women?

Why does *The Voice of Firestone* draw equally from city and farm, although *The Pause that Refreshes* gets two and one-fourth times its proportion of city over farm listeners?

With the *Family Hour* drawing equally from old and young adults, why

[1] Throughout the remainder of this article the phrase "its correct proportion," or "its expected proportion" has been used to mean "*the percentage one would expect the program to draw, in the light of its appeal to the opposite audience type.*"

does *City Service* draw half again as many in proportion from the ranks of those over 50 years of age?

The same differences in appeal from similarly designed programs is found in the field of popular music. Harry James's orchestra gets one-sixth more men than women in its audience, although Tommy Dorsey's orchestra draws one-third more women than men.

Why does *Horace Heidt* get one-third more than its proportion of farm listeners, although the *Hour of Charm* draws two and one-half times its proportion of city adults?

Why does *Fred Waring* appeal to two and one-half times the expected proportion of listeners with college education, although *Horace Heidt* draws half again the correct proportion of those with only a grade school education?

If *Old Fashioned Revival* appeals to three-fourths again as many male as female listeners as is expected of religious music programs, why does *Hymns of All Churches* appeal to half-again as many women as men? Or, if *Old Fashioned Revival* appeals to three-fourths again its proportion of farmers, why does *Hymns of all Churches* draw a bigger percentage of city people?

Making allowances for expected differences in liking for quiz shows, why does *Information Please* draw five and one-fourth times its expected proportion from the city, while *Battle of Sexes* draws twice the expected proportion from farms?

If *Truth or Consequences* can draw from one-half to three-fourths again the expected proportion from farm as from city, why does *Take It or Leave It* draw more city listeners?

If *Information Please* appeals to five and one-half times as great a percentage of college educated as could be expected, why does *People Are Funny* draw three-fourths more than its proportion from those with grade-school education?

Or, if *Dr I. Q.* appeals to one-fourth more than its correct percentage of grade-school educated persons, why does *Take It or Leave It* draw half again as many from those having attended college?

Why does *Kay Kyser's Variety Show* draw one-eighth greater percentage of men, whereas *Johnny Presents* variety show draws one-fourth more women?

If *Breakfast at Sardis* appeals to one-third more persons over 50 years of age, why does *Breakfast Club* appeal to one-fourth more listeners under 36? Or if *Breakfast at Sardis* appeals to two-thirds more than the expected proportion of grade-school educated listeners, why does *Breakfast Club* draw about the correct percentages of those with different degrees of education?

In the field of news commentators, differences are striking. Kaltenborn draws one-fifth more than the expected percentage from the city while Gabriel Heatter draws one-third greater percentage from the farm. Kaltenborn appeals to two and one-half times the expected percentage of those with college education, and Godwin draws one and three-fourths more than his expected percentage from this type; but Gabriel Heatter draws a greater percentage of those with grade-school education.

VI

These are merely examples of hundreds of wide variations from expected norms which research at the University of Wichita has pointed out. Perhaps they are not the best examples. The variations are not surprising; they should prove challenging instead. We have long suspected that audiences vary according to age and sex and education and place of residence, and that much finer audience classifications might be made. The surprising thing is that speech people do not seem interested in learning which

is of vital concern to the comedians; it is a challenge to speech research. It is not enough to say that "humor is an excellent interest device"; different types of humor interest different classes of people. Research must tell us more specifically *what* catches the fancy of the different types.

V

When dealing with a less universally interesting program type, the quality of appeal of different programs to different classes of people becomes even more striking. Each difference in appeal found in generally similar programs should challenge the speech investigator to fresh efforts.

After making allowances for general differences in liking for "complete drama programs," why does *The Aldrich Family* interest one-fourth more men than women, although *One Man's Family* interests one-third more women than men?

Why does *Screen Guild* interest one-fourth more women, while *First Nighter* interests an equal proportion of both sexes?

Or, from the standpoint of residence, when *One Man's Family* interests one-eighth more city people, why does *The Aldrich Family* interest two and one-fourth times the proportion of farmers? *Lights Out* interest about one-half again greater proportions of city than farm listeners, but *Inner Sanctum* interests three times its correct[1] proportion of city people.

From the standpoint of age, *First Nighter* interests an equal number of young and old, but *Screen Guild* interests half again as great a proportion under 35 years of age as it does those over 50, and *Dr. Christian* interests half-again as great a proportion of those over 50.

One Man's Family interests more college and grade educated adults, but *The Aldrich Family* interests three-fourths again its expected proportion of those with nothing but grade school education.

Again, allowing for differences to be found normally in the case of serial drama or soap operas, what causes similar programs to appeal to different proportions of the various classes of listeners?

Why does *Judy and Jane* draw twice its normal proportion of farm listeners, although *Vic and Sade* interests half-again its proportion of city audience? Why does *Lonely Woman* interest one-sixth more city than farm listeners, if *Portia Faces Life* attracts three and one-fourth times its proportion of those from farms, and *When a Girl Marries* draws four times its farm percentage?

Light of the World interests half again its proportion of city people, but *Guiding Light* draws half-again *its* proportion of farm listeners.

Vic and Sade interests two-thirds greater proportion of college educated than it does of grade school educated listeners, but *Judy and Jane* draw two and three-fourths times their proportion to those educated by grade school only, and *Stella Dallas* draws three times its proportion of this type of audience.

Making allowances for differences in general interest for classical music, why does the *Telephone Hour* draw an equal number of men and women, although *The Family Hour* (another serious music program) appeals to nearly three times its proportion of women?

Why does *The Voice of Firestone* draw equally from city and farm, although *The Pause that Refreshes* gets two and one-fourth times its proportion of city over farm listeners?

With the *Family Hour* drawing equally from old and young adults, why

[1] Throughout the remainder of this article the phrase "its correct proportion," or "its expected proportion" has been used to mean *"the percentage one would expect the program to draw, in the light of its appeal to the opposite audience type."*

does *City Service* draw half again as many in proportion from the ranks of those over 50 years of age?

The same differences in appeal from similarly designed programs is found in the field of popular music. Harry James's orchestra gets one-sixth more men than women in its audience, although Tommy Dorsey's orchestra draws one-third more women than men.

Why does *Horace Heidt* get one-third more than its proportion of farm listeners, although the *Hour of Charm* draws two and one-half times its proportion of city adults?

Why does *Fred Waring* appeal to two and one-half times the expected proportion of listeners with college education, although *Horace Heidt* draws half again the correct proportion of those with only a grade school education?

If *Old Fashioned Revival* appeals to three-fourths again as many male as female listeners as is expected of religious music programs, why does *Hymns of All Churches* appeal to half-again as many women as men? Or, if *Old Fashioned Revival* appeals to three-fourths again its proportion of farmers, why does *Hymns of all Churches* draw a bigger percentage of city people?

Making allowances for expected differences in liking for quiz shows, why does *Information Please* draw five and one-fourth times its expected proportion from the city, while *Battle of Sexes* draws twice the expected proportion from farms?

If *Truth or Consequences* can draw from one-half to three-fourths again the expected proportion from farm as from city, why does *Take It or Leave It* draw more city listeners?

If *Information Please* appeals to five and one-half times as great a percentage of college educated as could be expected, why does *People Are Funny* draw three-fourths more than its proportion from those with grade-school education?

Or, if *Dr I. Q.* appeals to one-fourth more than its correct percentage of grade-school educated persons, why does *Take It or Leave It* draw half again as many from those having attended college?

Why does *Kay Kyser's Variety Show* draw one-eighth greater percentage of men, whereas *Johnny Presents* variety show draws one-fourth more women?

If *Breakfast at Sardis* appeals to one-third more persons over 50 years of age, why does *Breakfast Club* appeal to one-fourth more listeners under 36? Or if *Breakfast at Sardis* appeals to two-thirds more than the expected proportion of grade-school educated listeners, why does *Breakfast Club* draw about the correct percentages of those with different degrees of education?

In the field of news commentators, differences are striking. Kaltenborn draws one-fifth more than the expected percentage from the city while Gabriel Heatter draws one-third greater percentage from the farm. Kaltenborn appeals to two and one-half times the expected percentage of those with college education, and Godwin draws one and three-fourths more than his expected percentage from this type; but Gabriel Heatter draws a greater percentage of those with grade-school education.

VI

These are merely examples of hundreds of wide variations from expected norms which research at the University of Wichita has pointed out. Perhaps they are not the best examples. The variations are not surprising; they should prove challenging instead. We have long suspected that audiences vary according to age and sex and education and place of residence, and that much finer audience classifications might be made. The surprising thing is that speech people do not seem interested in learning which

techniques appeal to one type and which to another. That the differences play a fundamental part in determining the success of radio programs we now know. But it is not enough to know that these differences exist. We must learn *how* to take advantage of them; what to do that will interest or make clear or persuade when we have a particular audience before us—whether from the platform or via the radio.

To the speech field, radio offers an opportunity to investigate. It offers the audience, it offers an unrivaled and perfect field of experimentation. Commercial interests are so vitally in need of more concrete information that they will gladly finance such research, if honestly and imaginatively conceived.[2] None of us can longer plead either lack of opportunity or lack of funds as reasons for knowing no more than we do about the demands of different types of audiences. I challenge the rhetorician to test carefully the pulling power, the width of appeal, the effectiveness with different classes, of all the devices with which speech people are familiar—one by one, scientifically! At long last we may be able to give to the world more than Carnegie-like advice. Rhetoricians should woo radio as a research bride, and stop ignoring her as the strange and mysterious ally of the dramatist.

[2] Based on evidence released by the FCC and on known percentages of listeners, it is estimated that 48,000 speakers would have to talk for 20 minutes each to audiences of 15,000 people, every day, to reach as many Americans with as many different words as are reached by radio. This estimate includes only the spoken parts of programs and does not include duplication broadcasts from the various network outlets.

ADAPTING "THE TEACHING CYCLE" TO DEBATE

KENNETH G. HANCE
University of Michigan

MANY and varied are the plans proposed and used for training a debate squad. Some represent the extreme of spoon-feeding by the coach, while others consist of catch-as-catch-can procedures conducted by the students, whether they be in high school or in college. Some are built upon the principle of heavy-handed guidance to effect economy of time and effort, whereas others proceed upon the assumption that the less the guidance the better the results.

At the risk of merely adding another plan to the many now used, I wish here to outline a basis of procedure that appears to have educational stature, that includes definite progression or development, and that can be applied to a variety of circumstances—length of season, number of debaters, and type of contest for which the preparation is being made. It has been used for several years with college debate squads, and it appears to have possibilities on the high-school level. Four topics will be developed in this exposition: 1) the assumptions underlying the program; 2) the principles upon which it is constructed; 3) the precise adaptation of these principles to debate; 4) a time schedule based upon this procedure.

The Assumptions

The assumptions are six in number: 1) the plan should be capable of adaptation to squads varying in size—from four debaters to twenty-four or more; 2) it should be adaptable to a squad composed of persons of varying abilities and degrees of experience; 3) the debaters should do considerable independent work even though there may (and should) be quite extensive guidance; 4)

there should be an educational (or psychological) basis underlying the program in order to justify its existence as a sound educational enterprise; 5) it should be progressive or functional—rationally leading with considerable self-motivation from step to step; 6) the program should thoroughly acquaint the debaters with the proposition and should provide ample intrasquad practice in case construction, refutation, and delivery.

The Underlying Principles

This program is constructed upon the principle of the "Teaching Cycle," enunciated by Henry C. Morrison in his *The Practice of Teaching in the Secondary School.*[1] This cycle includes five steps: Exploration, Presentation, Assimilation, Organization, and Recitation. It includes, first, the process of questioning oneself about the material to be covered in order to determine in advance what one does and does not know. "This is essentially the pre-test stage. In it the teacher endeavors to ascertain what is the present experiential background of the pupils as it is related to the new unit."[2] Second, the process of teaching the "major essentials"[3] or of providing a perspective of the unit to be covered. Third, the process of gathering and digesting material. Fourth, that of synthesizing and composing it in orderly form —that in which "the pupils now proceed to gather up all their material and construct an outline in which the argument is developed in logical and convincing order."[4] Finally, the process of presenting the material orally, as in a class-room recitation.

This cycle, Professor Morrison believes, is applicable to virtually any teaching situation, especially that concerned with the physical or the social sciences, where materials other than those contained in one textbook are frequently used. It is based upon sound educational theory, being progressive and also, to the greatest possible extent, relating the procedure to the resources of the student.

The Adaptation to Debate

Inasmuch as a debate season (or at least the stage of preparation) is essentially a highly motivated educative process, this teaching cycle can well be used exactly as described, the only variation being, perhaps, in terminology and in the precise uses to which the steps may be put. As to terminology, the following are useful titles for the steps: Self-Questioning, Getting a Perspective, Assimilating, Organizing, and Practicing for Delivery. The nature of each step and the means of using it can perhaps be best described by giving a step-by-step statement of procedure with an occasional illustration from the current high school proposition.

Self-Questioning

Given such a proposition as "Resolved, that the United States should join in reconstituting the League of Nations," the debaters should be led through a procedure of self-questioning. They should be directed to take stock mentally, to determine what they know about the origin and history of the question, about the relevant terms, about criteria by which to judge proposals, about the *status quo,* about the affirmative proposal, and about possible alternatives.

A useful means of conducting this procedure is through a Self-Questioning Sheet. Developed as indicated below, it should be composed by the coach well in advance of the first meeting of the squad and should represent, if possible, not

[1] Henry C. Morrison, *The Practice of Teaching in the Secondary School.* (Chicago, 1926), chapters XIV-XVII.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 225.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 226.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. 229.

only his best thinking but also the expert assistance of colleagues in, for instance, the social science fields. Its purpose is to probe the debater's fund of information and to guide his investigations soon to be conducted.

Ideally, this sheet should be prepared in time to hand out at the first squad meeting, where it can be briefly discussed by the coach and perhaps by the students. They should be instructed to devote a filing card or a page in their notebooks to each question, and to attempt, before doing any specific reading, to answer as many as possible in writing before the next meeting.

The Self-Questioning Sheet may contain 25 questions or 125—the more the better. In all probability, approximately twelve to fifteen for each of the categories listed below may be most satisfactory. The following are sample questions selected from a recently constructed sheet of approximately 130 questions, based upon the proposition: "Resolved, That the United States Should Join in Reconstituting the League of Nations."

Background Survey[5]

A. Origin and History
   1. When did the concept of international organization arise?
   2. What have been the types of international organizations?
   3. What conditions gave rise to the League of Nations?

   etc.

B. Immediate Cause for Debate
   1. Is wartime the proper time to debate postwar problems?
   2. What immediate concern with respect to postwar planning is there at present?

   etc.

Definition of Terms

A. Terms in the Proposition
   1. What is the meaning of "reconstitute"?

   etc.

B. Terms Related to the Proposition
   1. What is a "league"? A "federation"?

   etc.

Criteria

A. General
   1. What should be the criteria in terms of the world?
   2. What should be the criteria in terms of the United States?

   etc.

B. Specific
   1. Is the securing of the Four Freedoms a valid goal?

   etc.

Survey of the Present Situation

A. Its Nature
   1. What was the status of international relations just prior to World War II?

   etc.

B. Arguments for and against the Present Situation
   1. What criticisms were made against the League of Nations in the years immediately prior to the war?
   2. What criticisms were made against treaties and alliances?

   etc.

Survey of the Affirmative Proposal

A. Its Nature
   1. In what respect would the proposed plan be like the original League of Nations?
   2. Would all nations be members?

   etc.

B. Arguments for and against this Proposal
   1. Would this League be free from the weaknesses of the original?
   2. Would this League meet the needs of the present situation?

   etc.

Survey of Other Possible Proposals

A. A Federation of the United Nations
   1. Wherein would this be different from the affirmative proposal?
   2. Could this proposal meet the needs of the present situation?

   etc.

Getting a Perspective

The debaters are now ready to get a perspective of the proposition. Six means —some to be used independently and perhaps some in collaboration—are avail-

[5] For certain of the headings, as "Background Survey," "Survey of the Present Situation," etc., I am indebted to James M. O'Neill and James H. McBurney, *The Working Principles of Argument* (New York, 1932), chapter III.

able, with each having merits as a distinctive as well as a complementary process. They are, in essence:

1) getting a perspective through the reading of certain general articles, such as those often available in the *Congressional Digest, The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, The Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences,* or in special works for specific propositions.

2) Getting a perspective through the presentation by subject matter experts of the major implications of the proposition, together with the principal affirmative and negative lines of argument. (I have found that colleagues in economics, history, and political science are of invaluable aid here; ordinarily each of two or three squad meetings may be devoted to a lecture by one such expert, followed by a question-and-answer period.)

3) Getting a perspective through the presentation by the coach of the material just indicated. (This is recommended only when the subject-matter experts are not available.)

4) Getting a perspective through a series of talks by the more experienced members of the squad, each of whom has been assigned a phase of the pro and con material.

5) Getting a perspective through one or more short debates upon the several phases of the proposition (*the status quo,* the affirmative proposal, each of several alternatives, etc.).

6) Getting a perspective through the use of group discussion, as suggested by William M. Sattler in a recent article.[6]

Ideally several squad meetings should be devoted to this stage—perhaps two or three lectures and one or two discussions and/or reports on general, or background, reading.

Assimilating

At this stage the debaters should be made aware that their work thus far may be of little value unless it is thoroughly assimilated, and additional and specific information is acquired. They will need to be encouraged to conduct an analysis and a pigeon-holding of the material presented in the Self-Questioning and the Perspective stages to determine new phases of the proposition and to discover their needs with respect to further information.

Here the director should provide the debaters with a carefully selected bibliography and should assign items in this bibliography for study by each member and also for reporting on a cooperative basis. On the assumption, moreover, that reading and assimilating are best accomplished in conjunction with the immediate use of the material, there should be inaugurated at this point a series of round-table discussions and also of intrasquad debates.[7] (These may also provide a good means of developing in a preliminary way the Organization Step, to be considered next.) If possible, there should be two series of debates, with each person taking both the affirmative and the negative sides and with each team composed of two persons, preferably one experienced and the other inexperienced.

These debates should accomplish three purposes: 1) to make the information functional; 2) to align each debater with both sides of the proposition; 3) to enable the more experienced debaters to assist the less experienced in the process of analyzing the proposition, of constructing the cases, and of conducting the debates.

Supplementing these debates, there may well be several squad meetings at which reports should be made upon items in the bibliography and quizzes should be conducted upon phases of the question. At this stage several devices of motivation should be used by the coach, for while this is a vital step in preparation, many of the squad members will inevitably exhibit a tendency to short-

[6] William M. Sattler, "Some Values of Discussion in the Investigation and Analysis Phases of Debate," *The Gavel of Delta Sigma Rho,* XXV (1943), 54, 55, 68.

[7] *Ibid.,* 54, 55.

cut the extensive reading that is greatly needed.

Organizing

In a measure, all of the work thus far has been leading to this stage. The exploration, overview, and assimilation have, it is hoped, prepared the debaters to analyze and synthesize, and to formulate cases that will reflect systematic preparation. It is to be hoped, also, that original work by the debaters will have prepared *them* to do much of the organizing. (It is to be assumed that they have been made acquainted with the essentials of analysis and case construction and that they are familiar with the proof requirements of a proposition.)

The Organizing Stage may be developed by a five-step plan, although the first step may be omitted if special circumstances or the wishes of the coach dictate. 1) A few days in advance of the second step, the coach should meet with the veteran members of the squad for at least two sessions. At the first session the group should concentrate upon the affirmative case; and through what may well be a lengthy session formulate a specific, even if tentative, outline. At the second meeting the negative case should be similarly constructed. Each of these sessions should be informal and highly cooperative, with every person a strong contributor.

2) At least two squad meetings of two or more hours each should be devoted to this step. Under the leadership of two veteran members, appointed at one of the meetings mentioned above, the entire squad should be conducted through the outlines formulated in step one. Ideally, copies of these cases will have been typed or mimeographed, or the outlines written on the blackboard in advance of the squad meetings, so that all time can be devoted to intensive analysis and criticism. The chairman for each case should interpret the outline, explain the reasons for its make-up, and should defend it. Then all members should be encouraged to suggest alterations. Whenever possible, the coach should be but a moderator, making only occasional contributions to the arguments. As the outcome of each of these two meetings there should be formulated case outlines (not complete briefs) which will be tentative and also merely suggestive.

3) These cases, or variations of them, should immediately be put into action in further intrasquad debates, this time with graded teams selected on the basis of ability and experience. (The grading is recommended particularly in preparation for forthcoming tournaments, where, as a rule, team pairings are made on the basis of caliber.) It may even be desirable for the coach to rule that in these debates the cases developed in steps one and two must be used unless teams can present acceptable arguments to the contrary.)

4) Immediately after some of these intrasquad debates have been held, one or more squad meetings should be devoted to a reconsideration of the two cases, with amendments made where necessary.

5) Organization implies more than case construction alone. Attention should be paid to the classification and organization of all materials for purposes of both constructive and rebuttal work. Further, through additional squad meetings and intrasquad debates there can be developed various systems of strategy, including: a variety of cases, the best means of meeting specific arguments, team techniques of attack and defense, the organization of rebuttal speeches, etc. (Space limitations prevent a detailed exposition here of these methods and systems.) It is conceivable that weeks may be devoted to this phase of the Organizing Stage.

Practicing for Delivery

The purposes of this stage are at once apparent. While some attention has, of course, been paid in the previous stages to delivery, it is only logical that there will be need for the polishing of delivery. Just what will be done here will depend largely upon the point of view of, and the method preferred by, the coach. Some may hope to achieve improvement in delivery through participation in intrasquad and interscholastic practice debates followed by criticism, whereas others may use the method of working with the debators individually. Perhaps a combination of the two methods can be most heartily recommended.

A Time Schedule

The time schedule given below has been constructed, and is presented, with at least the following assumptions in mind: 1) the debaters possess at least a rudimentary knowledge of argumentation; or, at least, little is to be included here; 2) the "teaching cycle" is to be used; 3) there will be at least two squad meetings per week, plus one or more hours of work per week in small groups or by individuals; 4) approximately five or six weeks will be available before interscholastic practice debates or tournaments will be held; 5) after approximately eight weeks there will be decision debates, official tournaments, or public occasions which represent at least the beginning of the work for which the period of preparation has been designed; 6) modifications may be made as desired or required.

The following symbols are used: (a) indicates the first squad meeting each week; (b) indicates the second squad meeting; (c) indicates such additional sessions as conferences with individuals or teams, intrasquad debates, round-table discussions, etc.

Exploration

First week

(a) Orientation, prospectus, introduction to Self-Questioning Sheet
(b) Review of Self-Questioning Sheet (answers to be written by the debaters)
(c) Conference with each debater

Getting a Perspective

Second week

(a) Lecture by an authority, *or* some other procedure previously mentioned
(b) Same as (a)
(c) Conferences with groups to review the lectures

Third week

(a) Short debates (as previously described) Partition of the bibliography

Assimilation

Third week

(b) Reports on bibliography, *or* round tables

Fourth week

(a) Reports on bibliography, *or* round tables
(b) Reports on bibliography, *or* round tables
(c) Intrasquad debates (one experienced and one inexperienced member, if possible)

Fifth week

(a) Reports on bibliography, *or* round tables
(b) Reports on bibliography, *or* round tables
(c) Intrasquad debates, with sides reversed

Organization

Sixth week

(a) Work on affirmative case (preceded by meeting of experienced debaters)
(b) Work on negative case (preceded by meeting of experienced debaters)
(c) Intrasquad debates (teams graded, if possible)

Seventh week

(a) Amending and polishing of affirmative case
(b) Amending and polishing of negative case
(c) Intrasquad debates

DELIVERY—ORGANIZATION

Eighth week

(a) Work on attack and defense, rebuttal speeches, etc.
(b) Work on attack and defense, rebuttal speeches, etc.
(c) Intrasquad debates, *or* specific work on delivery

Ninth week

(a) Demonstration debate by best teams to demonstrate cases, attack and defense, delivery, etc.)
(b) Review of bibliography; work on attack and defense
(c) Intrasquad debates, *or* individual practice

REALISM IN EARLY AMERICAN ART AND THEATRE

JONATHAN CURVIN
Vanderbilt University

A BOSTONIAN "Member of the General Court" was probably expressing the censure shared by many of his compatriots when in 1786 he sneeringly included among the "unprofitable labourers" of the State "painters, (particularly inside, house, miniature and portrait painters), hairdressers, tavern keepers, musicians, stage players, buffoons and exhibitors of birds and puppets."[1] This contempt for the country's impoverished art was echoed later in a letter of S. F. B. Morse, who, upon visiting London in 1811, reflected on the contrast between America, where art was demeaned as "an employment suited to the lower class of people," and England, where it provided a constant topic of conversation.[2] Mrs. Trollope uncharitably observed in Cincinnati "a most extravagant passion for wax figures," and noted that the city's two museums of natural history "vie with each other in displaying specimens of this barbarous branch of art."[3]

If we accept such deprecatory remarks as these, there would seem to have been after the Revolution extremely little in American art and theatre to suggest the existence even of any body of art products, much less of a strong, pervasive aesthetic credo. Yet, with the perspective the intervening years afford, we may temper the harsh opinion of early pessimists, as we contemplate the very considerable products of early American studio and stage, and detect the presence therein even before 1800 of a traditional mode of expression, that of realism.

Any definition of realism is arbitrary and subject to assault. The term as used here will apply to that which results from the accurate and objective recording of what the artist has himself seen or otherwise experienced. This definition, by no means all-inclusive, is at least convenient.

II

The earliest substantial evidence of realistic art in America is to be found in seventeenth-century portraiture, not by professional artists in our sense of the term, but by itinerant face-painters, or *limners*. Portraiture remained, in fact, until well into the nineteenth century the one approved medium for the artists. Landscape painting tarried behind, chiefly because the colonists could not divorce nature's utility from nature's beauties. Practical considerations blurred the purely aesthetic view. So the Long Island diarist of 1676 surveyed the countryside with these words: "Yea, in May you shall see the woods and fields so curiously bedecked with roses and an

[1] *National Arithmetick or Observations on the Finances of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts* (Boston, 1786), p. 21.
[2] S. F. B. Morse, *Letters and Journals*, edited by E. L. Morse (Boston, 1914), I, 46.
[3] Mrs. Trollope, *Domestic Manners of the Americans* (London, 1832), p. 68.

innumerable multitude of delightful flowers . . . that you may behold nature contending with art, and striving to equal if not excel many gardens in England; nay, did we know the virtue of all these plants and herbs growing there (which time may more discover) many are of the opinion, and the natives do affirm, that there is no disease common to the country, but may be cured without materials from other nations."[4]

The limners, independent, nonprofessional, respecting the tenets or theories of no school, nor heeding the changing manners of alien art, were ingenious craftsmen. Few of these face-painters have emerged from anonymity, but we do know something of their methods. They introduced quantity production into art. In winter they would prepare for their trade by blocking out sets of stock figures, male and female, with backgrounds, clothing, accessories, even hands painted in. When summer came the limners would go from town to town hunting heads to complete the pictures. The sitter would merely choose the figure he preferred, and the painter, for fees ranging from ten to forty dollars, would accommodate by filling in a face between the already completed hair and the collar.[5] Frequently these versatile limners, instead of touring about, would establish a store or shop, where they could earn a regular income while limning as a side line. Their advertisements might then read, "Old Madeiras and other wines, groceries, and most kinds of painting done at reasonable rates," or, "A choice collection of books, pictures, and pickles."[6]

The colonists evidently saw nothing odd in juxtaposing "pictures and pickles," for portrait painting was simply a means of recording faces, for sentimental or social reasons, and had nothing to do with "art"; it was an utilitarian craft, precursor of and substitute for photography. As Virgil Barker says, "The founding fathers of the nation were preceded by the founding fathers of families who required effigies equally with furniture as a means of consolidating and maintaining their social position."[7]

The recurrent claim these early painters made in their advertisements was that their products would be "correct." Time and again this word appears, leading us to assume that correctness was the primary criterion of the limner's skill. James Sharples, for example, relied on the fidelity of his reproductions to sell his protraits. Sharples would appear in a community, and beg the honour of doing a portrait of the gentry, merely, as he said, for his own "collection." In two hours Sharples would complete a faithful likeness of the sitter, who, impressed, would be pleased to buy the picture. So it can be seen that portrait-painting was a business first, an art incidentally if at all. The successful limner was he who painted true portraits that could be handed down from generation to generation as exact likenesses. Typical would be the famous seventeenth century "Mrs. Elizabeth Freake and Baby Mary," painted about 1675 by an unknown artist, and showing the patient reproduction of detail so characteristic of this early art. Joseph Badger (1708-1765), sometime Massachusetts glazier and house painter, inherited the limner's realism, as is evident in his portrait, "Mrs. Thomas Stevenson." And there were other craftsmen-portraitists from the ranks of carriage-makers, saddlers and silversmiths, who conveyed in their portraits the essentially craftsmanlike attributes of honesty, self-reliance, and directness of approach.

Our earliest professional painters, too,

[4] Quoted in Oskar Hagen, *The Birth of the American Tradition in Art* (1940), p. 60, from *Brief Description of Long Island*, edited by Henri Beston (1937), p. 31.

[5] Holger Cahill, "American Folk Art," *The American Mercury*, XXIV (1931), 41.

[6] Hagen, *op. cit.*, p. 22.

[7] Virgil Barker, *A Critical Introduction to American Painting* (1931), p. 14.

adopted the limners' technique and criteria. Robert Feke (1705-1750) may be viewed as a transitional figure between the early peripatetic painters and the accomplished John Singleton Copley. Strictly in accord with the colonial traditions, he tried with honest bluntness to paint his sitters as faithfully from life as he could. And Copley, before he settled in London to come under the influence of the British methods, essayed portraits of the New England mercantile aristocracy that were marked by directness and honesty, a keen observation of character and a power to render appearances exactly. John Adams was moved to praise Copley's likenesses for their "truth, nature and fact; you can scarcely help discoursing with them, asking questions and receiving answers."[8]

III

Just as we can accredit the native portraitist with holding the mirror up to nature, so can we say the same for his fellow "unprofitable labourers," those occupied in the early American theatre, dramatists, scene-designers and actors.

Of the few surviving pre-Revolution play manuscripts, perhaps the most significant is *Ponteach; or, The Savages of America,* by Major Robert Rogers (1727-1795). This play, published in 1766, shows classical tragedy's traditional blank verse curiously mingled with subject matter distinctly American and contemporary. Here is the first Indian play, based on the uprising of the Ottawa chief, Pontiac, in 1763. Rogers, a famous backwoodsman and Indian fighter, expressed in his drama his indignation at the barbarous cruelty suffered by the Indians at the hands of English traders and officials.

In spite of the solemn rhetoric of Rogers' blank verse, spoken alike by Indians, frontiersmen, traders and military officers, in spite also of a disconcerting formlessness of structure, *Ponteach* skillfully avoids idealizing the Indian. The ambitious chief of the Great Lakes region is not an untarnished romantic hero, but is quite a complex character,—suspicious, visionary, imaginative, superstitious, impulsive and crafty. Rogers also cleverly drew upon his experience to supply such realistic bits of business as a conjuror's howling and breast-beating, and the gruesome picture of the young braves tossing captured scalps between them.

In 1774, on the recommendation of the Continental Congress, the colonial theatres were almost all closed, and performances by professional companies were curtailed. Until 1787 what native plays came to be written were not even intended for production, but, almost totally lacking in universal appeal, and definitely circumscribed by time and local conditions, were "vehicles of expression for intense feelings and cherished convictions, as mediums of self-assertion, of condemnation, or of exhortation to the oppressed."[9]

The authors of these polemical satires, which were composed in the heat of controversy, and frequently drew upon the day's issues, were interested neither in the theatre nor in producing permanent dramatic literature. None of their efforts were in strict dramatic form; there is no conclusive evidence they were ever acted. But slight as their artistic quality may be, the best of these sketches, those by Hugh Henry Brackenridge, John Leacock, and Mrs. Mercy Warren, do succeed in "reproducing the ideas, the passions, the motives and the moods of that stormful time in our history with a frankness, a liveliness and an unshrinking realism not

[8] Quoted in Hagen, *op. cit.*, p. 87.

[9] Perley Isaac Reed, *The Realistic Presentation of American Characters in Native American Plays Prior to Eighteen-Seventy* (Columbus, Ohio, 1918), p. 14.

approached by any other species of Revolutionary literature."[10]

The closing years of the eighteenth century, bringing a return to peaceful pursuits, gave considerable impetus to the expansion and improvement of the American theatre. Over thirty original plays were written during the decade, 1787-1797. Most of them were frankly imitative of foreign models, it is true, but one of the lot, Royall Tyler's comedy, *The Contrast,* rightly holds a distinguished place in American dramatic history.

Although the plot of *The Contrast* owes much to British sentimental comedy, and the hero, Col. Manly, and the heroine, Maria, are the conventional type characters of the school, the comic servant, Jonathan, lifts Tyler's play above the ruck of imitations. The original of a long succession of stage Yankees to appear in American plays,[11] Jonathan reproduces with considerable fidelity the fundamental traits of the substantial New Englander: original homely humor, an independent air, common sense, concern for his material goods and a puritanic morality that makes him shun the theatre as the abode of Satan himself. In *The Contrast* Tyler provided humor by deliberately exploiting the provincialisms familiar to his audience. The character of Jonathan is obviously exaggerated, but beneath the caricature is a fresh dramatic conception, distinctive, national and vital.

In many passages, furthermore, *The Contrast* refers to contemporary matters which are interesting historically. Jonathan's famous story of his visit to the theatre offers an acceptable picture of the early playhouse and social customs. The second scene of Act II is "The Mall"; the ladies speak of walking "on the Battery"; and Col. Manly's heroic discourses on the glory of Washington and the Revolution reflect the exuberant patriotism doubtless shared in 1787 by those who witnessed the play. While not a thorough or comprehensive study of social life, *The Contrast* nevertheless does contain suggestive representations of current dress, entertainment, manners, sentiments, morals and character, and thereby belongs in the realistic tradition.

IV

To visualize the manner of production in the colonial theatre, we must imagine a somewhat humble copy of the London stage scenery of the time. Even if the play demanded the suggestion of an American locale, the traditional imported modes of representation were made to serve. It is not surprising that the original setting for *The Contrast* was "an interior that had often been a London apartment."[12] This was the era of the scene painter, whose brush was called upon not only to decorate the ornate backdrops and their appropriate wings, but also to paint into the scenic picture chairs, tables, and other furnishings not to be used practically. By the end of the eighteenth century the painter's position in the American theatre rivaled in importance that of the actor.

After the Revolution the theatre's lavish patriotic spectacles enabled the scenic artist to try his hand at reproducing some American scenes, made familiar by the historic events of the period. In 1797 John D. Burk, author of *Bunker Hill; or The Death of General Warren,* wrote to John Hodgkinson, manager of the John Street Theatre in New York, instructing the latter on stag-

[10] Moses Coit Tyler, *The Literary History of the American Revolution, 1763-1783* (1897), II, 192.

[11] Among the immediate successors to Jonathan in the eighteenth century drama may be noted the Yankee Servant in Dunlap's *The Modest Soldier* (1787); Dolly in Samuel Low's *The Politician Outwitted* (1788); and Susannah in Dunlap's *The Father* (1788).

[12] George O. Seilhamer, *History of the American Theatre* (Philadelphia, 1888), II, 227.

ing the piece in accordance with methods already found successful in the Boston production:

> A square piece about nine feet high and five wide, having some houses and a meeting-house painted on fire, with flame and smoak issuing from it, should be raised two feet distance from the horizon scene at the back of your stage, the windows and doors cut out for transparencies—in a word, it should have the appearance of a town on fire. We had painted smoak suspended—it is raised at the each wing, and is intended to represent Charleston, and is on a line with the hill, and where it is lowest. The fire should be played skilfully behind this burning town, and the smoak to evaporate. When the curtain rises in the fifth, the appearance of the whole is good—Charleston on fire, the breast-works of wood, the Americans appearing over the works and the muzzles of their guns, the English and the American music, the attack of the hill, the falling of the English troops, Warren's half descending the hill and animating the Americans, the smoak and confusion, all together produce an effect scarce credible. . . . We had a scene of State-street—if you had one it would not be amiss—we used it instead of the scene of Boston Neck. . . . We had our hill on the left side of the stage—the painting of Charleston should not be seen till the fifth act. . .[13]

At the Park Theatre in New York William Dunlap sensed the public's appreciation for spectacle with localized settings. In 1799 his *The Fourth of July; or Temple of American Independence* included "a view of the lower part of Broadway, Battery, harbor and shipping, taken on the spot."[14]

The excessive devotion to elaborate scenery as a means of attracting the public continued as a feature of the American theatre throughout the early decades of the nineteenth century. Many producers boasted of the accuracy with which their settings duplicated national scenes. Then gradually the stage spectacles, which in part appealed through the extravagance of the painter's conceptions or the mechanical ingenuity of the stage manager, were succeeded by settings notable solely because they presented local scenes which members of the audience could easily identify and compare with the familiar reality.

V

When Montrose Moses remarked, in referring to characteristics of the early American drama, "It was the genius of the actors . . . that encouraged the American type,"[15] he stated a truth that becomes evident in any review of the practical theatre as it developed from Colonial beginnings. Generally the plays in which the actors appeared have long since been almost completely forgotten; but there is indisputable evidence that at one time they often gained international prestige, not through literary merit, or even as stage-pieces, but through their vigorous performance by native actors.

The stage Yankee probably comes nearest of all the roles to being a national representative. His vogue was the most long-lived, his influence the most unrestricted. As already observed, Royall Tyler had in 1787 enlivened *The Contrast* by introducing the servant, Jonathan, "a true-born Yankee son of liberty." The years to follow saw the American stage populated with a vast assortment of Jonathans, bound to the original by traits of rough sincerity and belligerent patriotism which the audiences chose to consider distinctively American. He might be called "Jonathan Ploughboy," or "Lot Sapsago," or "Jedediah Homebred" or "Deuteronomy Dutiful." The plays in which he appeared might be trivial concoctions, and Jonathan was

[13] Quoted in William Dunlap, *A History of the American Theatre* (1832), pp. 162-3.
[14] Quoted in William B. Wood, *Personal Recollections of the Stage* (Philadelphia, 1855), p. 67.
[15] Montrose J. Moses, *The American Dramatist* (Boston, 1911), p. 50.

often "written in" as a grotesque caricature. How could audiences possibly discern in this clownlike figure even a modicum of truth? Evidently we must seek the answer outside the printed plays.

As the character of the Yankee became in native playwriting a stock figure, there developed a group of American players so proficient in delineating the character on the stage as to earn the title, "Yankee actors." Audiences, it must be remembered, identified the various Yankee roles with particular mannerisms of these actors, and where the plays themselves might be mere shells of trite situations, the actors brought their peculiar genius to the interpretation of the Yankee distortion, and gave it a veracity we have no way of experiencing or testing.

The best of these actor-specialists consciously employed realistic methods. James Henry Hackett (1800-1871) early took advantage of the Yankee's popularity, and jealously regarded the character of "Solomon Swop," protagonist of *Jonathan in England,* as a personal property, not to be performed by any other player. A fellow actor reported, upon seeing Hackett's performance, "I consider his Solomon Swop the most natural and unexaggerated Yankee I ever saw upon the stage."[16] George Handel Hill or "Yankee" Hill as he was better known, who made repeated journeys to his native New England for affectionate study of the characters there, produced stage portraits marked by truth, restraint and simplicity. "We but echo public opinion," runs one contemporary account, "when we affirm that in the exhibition of the quiet, dry humor, peculiar to *the* Yankee, par excellence, he stands unrivalled."[17]

[16] George Vandenhoff, *Leaves from an Actor's Note-Book, or, Anecdotes of the Green-Room and Stage* (London, 1860), p. 196.

[17] Quoted in George C. D. Odell, *Annals of the New York Stage* (1927-1939), IV, 206.

VI

The orientation of American art and theatre remains uncompleted, and we can but speculate as to what the future patterns will be. The retrospective view, meanwhile, suggests that in his periods of early struggle the creative artist adjusted himself to a developing realistic tradition, which, with rebuffs and delays, has persisted in native art and the theatre even to the present day.

The gifted Colonial limner could supplement the income he derived from portraiture by turning to the construction of a carriage or the daubing of a shop sign. Of necessity practical, his art fulfilled a practical function, that of rendering on canvas a precise likeness. The limner, furthermore, illustrates the factual bias of the craftsman which was to be a constant trait of the early theatre.

It may well be that a profounder significance can be attached to the factuality evinced in early portraiture, in the drama and theatre. In these often crude products may be reflected an attitude of mind peculiarly American, consonant with national pride and democratic sentiments, and it might be advanced that here was an early fulfillment of Whitman's requirements for self-reliant creative endeavor, independent of foreign imitativeness, and respectful of immediate actualities:

> . . . In paintings or mouldings or carvings in mineral or wood, or in the illustrations of books and newspapers, or in any comic or tragic prints, or in the patterns of woven stuffs or anything to beautify rooms or furniture or costumes, or to put upon cornices or monuments or on the prows or sterns of ships, or to put anywhere before the human eye indoors or out, that which distorts honest shapes or which creates unearthly beings or places or contingencies, is a nuisance and revolt.[18]

[18] Walt Whitman, *Preface to Leaves of Grass, 1855* (London, 1881), pp. 20-21.

THE INDIANS HAVE NO WORD FOR IT:

II. Stuttering in Adults

WENDELL JOHNSON
State University of Iowa

IN THE preceding issue of the JOURNAL we discussed stuttering in young children.[1] In adults the problem is quite different, but in both children and adults certain general principles are fundamental. To begin with, *a clear distinction must be made between nonfluency and stuttering.* Most young children and many adults speak quite nonfluently, repeating frequently, pausing conspicuously, saying *ah* or *uh,* etc. They speak very differently from stutterers, however, who may be even quite fluent by ordinary standards but who exhibit considerable strain, embarrassment, and apprehensiveness with regard to such nonfluency as they do have. It is the stutterer's anxiety and strain, the fear and the effort with which he pauses or says *uh,* repeats sounds or prolongs them, that serve to distinguish him from the so-called normal speaker.

I

It is commonly supposed that what ails the stutterer is that he cannot speak fluently. The degree to which such misconceptions as this can come to be widely accepted is, indeed, fascinating. *The fact of the matter is that the stutterer cannot talk nonfluently.* He can speak fluently all right; so long as his speech is fluent, as it is 80 per cent or more of the time in the majority of cases, his speech cannot very well be distinguished from that of a normal speaker. To say that stutterers cannot talk fluently is to commit a fantastic misrepresentation of the facts. If they talked nonfluently as well as they talk fluently they could only be regarded as normal speakers. Their peculiarity lies in the fact that whenever they do hesitate or repeat they make a great show of fear and effort, instead of proceeding to stumble along calmly as normal speakers do.

In a fundamental sense, stuttering is not a speech defect at all, although excessive nonfluency might sometimes be so regarded. Stuttering is an evaluational disorder. It is what results when normal nonfluency is evaluated as something to be feared and avoided; it is, outwardly, what the stutterer does in an attempt to avoid nonfluency. On such a basis his reluctance to speak at all, his shyness, his excessive caution in speaking, his great effort to speak perfectly, which shows up in his facial grimaces, bodily contortions and strained vocalizations—all this, which is what we call stuttering, becomes understandable when viewed as avoidance reactions, reactions designed to avoid the nonfluency which the individual has learned to fear and dread and expect.

In the normal speaker nonfluency is simply a *response,* occasioned by some external stimulus or, perhaps, by a lack of vocabulary or preparation. As a response, in this sense, nonfluency is, indeed, normal. For the stutterer, on the other hand, nonfluency has become a *stimulus,* to which he reacts with anxiety and with an effort to avoid it and its supposed social consequences. Nonfluency as a response is hardly a problem; nonfluency as a stimulus is something else again. The child's repetitions of sounds, words, and phrases are of no consequence, until they come to serve as a stimulus for his parents or teachers. When that happens,

[1] Wendell Johnson, "The Indians Have No Word for It: I. Stuttering in Children," QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH, XXX (October, 1944), 330-337.

they tend to become for the child the same sort of stimulus they are for his parents and teachers, who, in large measure, create his semantic environment. As they react with worry and disapproval and with an effort to get the child not to repeat, so the child in time adopts their worry and disapproval of his own speech, and consequently he makes a great effort to talk without repeating. These attitudes and this effort are, in the main, what constitute stuttering. Simple hesitancy in speech is normal and harmless. But *to hesitate to hesitate* is relatively serious in its consequences.

It is these attitudes of fear and embarrassment, and this second-order hesitating to hesitate, these anxious exertions of effort to speak perfectly and without nonfluency—these are the symptoms of stuttering that stand out in the adult. They may be present in rather young children, of course, since in some semantic environments it does not take very long for the child's own evaluative behavior to become seriously affected. The essential point is that before the child has interiorized his semantic environment to a very considerable degree, the problem can be dealt with effectively for the most part by changing the semantic environment itself, without any direct attempt to change the child's own evaluative or overt behavior so far as his speech is concerned. Besides, a child's semantic environment tends to be fairly largely confined to the home and is created by very few individuals, so that it *can* be changed effectively in a great many cases.

II

In the case of older children and adults, on the other hand, a more direct attack on the problem is usually necessary. The individual's semantic environment extends eventually beyond the home or the school; it becomes too big to be easily manipulated. Besides (and this is more important) the individual has interiorized it. His nonfluency has become a stimulus, not only for the people around him, but also for him. He reacts to it in his own right, so to speak. It is his own evaluations that now largely determine his overt behavior, and so those evaluations must be attacked directly. All the relevant factors are interrelated, however, and it is generally more effective to work on all of them than to limit attention to one only. Anything that can be done to change the semantic environment, to modify attitudes and policies in the home, school, neighborhood or community, or to educate "public opinion" in the larger sense, helps to promote favorable changes in the individual's own evaluative behavior. Likewise, any changes that can be brought about more or less directly in the stutterer's manner of stuttering in order to make it more bearable, may make it easier for him to evaluate it differently. Moreover, a program of physical hygiene will sometimes help to keep the individual "feeling good," so that he will have the energy for an enthusiastic and sustained attempt to overcome his difficulties.

From this point of view, then, the problem of stuttering is not to be regarded elementalistically as being *either* "physical" *or* "mental," either "organic" or "emotional." It is neither "all in the mind" nor "all in the tongue." The approach throughout is nonelementalistic and relativistic. Nor is it to be missed that within this frame of reference, no two stutterers are to be regarded as exactly alike. The specific procedures that appear to be most helpful in one case may not be helpful in another. We must go further and say that the specific measures that are advisable for a particular stutterer at one time, or in one situation, are not necessarily advisable at another time and under other circum-

stances. There is no single method of treating stuttering from the point of view here presented. Any particular stutterer is to be examined, evaluated, and treated extensionally with reference to the specific alterations advisable and feasible in his own case. It is even possible that for some stutterers the factor of physical constitution would be more important than any other, although in the general run of cases other factors would appear to be of definitely greater significance.

III

On the basis of this general statement, it is possible to discuss in more specific terms the treatment of stuttering in well-developed or adult cases:

Semantic environment. As a general rule, it is advisable to see to it that the stutterer's family, teachers, employer, friends, and associates are made acquainted with the nature of his problem. An explanation, in simplified terms if necessary, along the lines presented here, will often go far to weaken the taboo against nonfluency which the stutterer usually feels whenever he speaks at home, in school, or elsewhere.

For example, most people are inclined to praise a stutterer when he speaks fluently. The practical effect of this is to strengthen the stutterer's conviction that he should never speak nonfluently; as a consequence, he tends to become a bit more anxious and to exhibit more tension in his attempts to avoid nonfluency. In other words, he tends to stutter more severely when praised for speaking fluently. *It is better to praise the stutterer whenever he handles his nonfluency calmly and without undue strain.* This notion may sound odd to those who are unfamiliar with the problem, but there are very few parents, teachers, or other persons who will not do what they can to help a stutterer, once they see clearly what there is to do. In general, what there is to do is to adopt the attitude—and mean it—that the stutterer is under no obligation whatever to speak fluently, that, in fact, he is to be complimented for speaking nonfluently in an unworried, unhurried, effortless and forthright manner.

It is also generally advisable to create in the stutterer's semantic environment the attitude that he is a worthy individual. He should be able to feel sure of his parents' affection and reasonable moral support without having to struggle for it. He should not be given reason to suppose that his teachers pity him, or look down on him as a person. His employer should make clear to him the respects in which his speech is and is not the basis for any criticisms of his work, and he should help him to see those aspects of his work in which his efficiency is not affected by his speech difficulty. It will pay the employer in the long run to follow such a policy, and it will help the stutterer considerably to achieve an adequate re-evaluation of himself and of his speech.

It is well to encourage a stutterer to develop his talents along various lines, and to provide opportunities for him to do so. One of the marks of a healthful semantic environment is that it provides the individual with stimulation for possible self-development. It should not, however, stimulate him beyond the reasonable limits of his ability, for to do that is to invite failure, and nothing fails like failure. Experiences of success, on the other hand, are healthful in their effects. In order to experience successes, one's goals must be reasonably specific and recognizable, and they must be practically attainable. But there must be goals; one must be provided with something at which to shoot, so to speak, and with the opportunity to shoot at it. If a stutterer has athletic ability, or can serve as school cheer-leader, or shows promise

of becoming a writer or trombone player, then he should be provided with the necessary opportunities to experience success accordingly. It is definitely beneficial to have a good opinion of oneself—based on performance, properly evaluated. If a stutterer can have positive evaluations of himself as a person, he is correspondingly more likely to evaluate his speech nonfluency with less dread and trepidation.

Finally, it should be said that most stutterers should be encouraged to speak as much as possible. In this respect, however, parents and teachers need to be realistically alert. For a stutterer, speaking can be extremely gruelling and demoralizing, and any stutterer varies considerably from time to time in his ability to "take it." In general, it is advisable for him to do most of his speaking, and as much speaking as he can, in such situations as he can manage with the greatest poise and satisfaction. But he should be encouraged and helped to extend the range of such situations. Most stutterers will benefit from speaking in those situations in which no premium is placed on fluency. As the stutterer loses his dread of nonfluency he speaks with less anxiety, and with less hesitation and strain—that is to say, with less stuttering. This general principle should guide the stutterer's parents and teachers in providing him with speaking experience.

So far as oral recitation in school is concerned, it is best for the teacher to discuss the matter frankly with the pupil, making clear to him that he may recite if he wants to, and that in doing so he need feel no obligation to talk perfectly. He may prefer to recite only when he volunteers to do so. It may be advisable to excuse him from the wear and tear of longer recitations, such as book reports. It may even be advisable to excuse him from all oral work, to arrange matters so that he need not even answer roll call. In such a case extra written work might well be assigned. In other cases, no special consideration whatever need be given so far as oral work is concerned. Every case must be handled on its own merits. There are no rules of thumb. The main thing is to see to it that the child does not become demoralized, and that he develops such evaluations of himself and his speech that he will want to speak and that he will enjoy speaking to the greatest possible degree.

One more point: As far as possible, the stutterer himself should undertake the task of changing his semantic environment. In this way the job will be done more thoroughly, and the stutterer will be developing a frankness about his own problem in talking about it to others, and he will be acquiring valuable experience in dealing directly with his elders and associates. "I, a stranger and afraid in a world I never made," in the words of the poet Housman, is not the theme song of an individual who takes upon himself as much as he can the responsibility for making his own semantic environment. It is of great adjustive value to learn that the evaluations which other people make of oneself, and the attitudes they have which affect one's own living, can in a measure be determined by one's own efforts. A stutterer, like anyone else, needs to learn that he is in large measure responsible for the manner in which others regard him and for the policies toward him which they adopt.

IV

Evaluative behavior. Evaluative behavior, as the term is here used, involves the forming and expression of attitudes, beliefs, wishes, likes and dislikes, assumptions, etc. We are not born with opinions or attitudes; rather, we are born into a semantic environment from which we derive them. The notion that repetitious

speech is socially taboo is one of the features of many semantic environments in our culture. Whenever this taboo is highly developed, the child is put under considerable strain, since repetition is one of the prominent characteristics of speech in its early stages. The baby does not say, *Da,* but, *Da, da, da.* This tendency to repeat continues into early childhood and even into the adult years to some extent. It is very significant, therefore, that such writers as Froeschels, Bluemel, and Van Riper have emphasized that "primary stuttering"—"stuttering" in its early stages—consists of simple repetition. It is very significant, that is, that they have called such repetition "primary *stuttering.*" We have seen that this sort of repetition is quite normal, especially during early childhood, and the fact that even speech experts would call it "stuttering" indicates the extent to which, in our society, speech repetition is tabooed, or disapproved.

Once a child has been called a stutterer, it is this taboo against nonfluency that is of particular importance in his semantic environment. The very fact that he is called a stutterer serves to strengthen the taboo. It is likely that if you have never been regarded as a stutterer, you can come nowhere near appreciating the uncanny, crushing power of the social disapproval of whatever is regarded as stuttering. It is probably one of the most frightening, perplexing and demoralizing influences to be found in our culture. In this connection, it is of great interest that a similar condition is found to exist among certain primitive tribes. For instance, in his book, *Primitive Behavior,* Professor W. I. Thomas says, "Almost every Bantu man and woman is a fluent and sustained speaker, and Dr. Gordon Brown, who is working among one of the tribes, informs one that the most prevalent mental disturbance is in youths who realize that they are unable to become finished speakers."[2]

Stuttering, in the writer's opinion, is quite incomprehensible unless one takes this cultural factor of taboo into account. On the other hand, the behavior of stutterers appears to be quite understandable when viewed as their attempts to avoid nonfluency, and thus to avoid the consequences of the taboo against nonfluency. We have seen that what happens to bring about the stutterer's difficulty is that his parents or teachers confuse or identify his normal nonfluency with stuttering. To the child, then, nonfluency comes to be the *same* as stuttering. For him, the taboo against stuttering becomes generalized as a taboo against nonfluency. Out of this semantic confusion, he develops the fearful effort, exaggerated hesitancy, etc., which we call well-developed stuttering. He develops this behavior as an attempt to avoid the nonfluency that was originally disapproved, but this stuttering behavior is disapproved also, and he is left in a disheartening quandary from which he can see no possibility of escaping.

V

Now most speech correctionists attack this problem (without stating the problem in these terms, however) by attempting to build up the stutterer's confidence in his ability to speak perfectly. In order to do this, they try to get the stutterer to speak while thoroughly relaxed, or to speak very slowly with a sort of drawl, or to speak in a monotone, or in time to some set rhythm, etc. The resulting speech, while usually free from "stuttering," is frequently more or less grotesque. Try going to a restaurant and ordering a meal with any one of these speech patterns, and you will get the point. If the parents of stutterers would adopt such

[2] W. I. Thomas, *Primitive Behavior, an Introduction to the Social Sciences* (1937).

speech patterns for themselves they would probably be less gullible in accepting the recommendations of those who advocate them. What such methods amount to is a powerful reinforcement of the taboo against stuttering with which the stutterer has been contending. What the so-called speech correctionist says, in effect, is this: *"Don't stutter. Whatever you do, don't stutter. You can even talk in this strange manner that I am suggesting, but don't stutter."*

If, for some odd reason, the stutterer is actually content to speak in the grotesque manner that is advocated, or if, by some miracle, he gains from the use of it a kind of abnormal confidence in an ability to speak perfectly, the results might be in a way satisfactory. But the writer has used such methods on himself, and he has seen many other stutterers who have used them, and it would seem that the results are usually tragic. It is common knowledge that, except in rare instances, these artificial speech patterns tend to wear out; in time the individual stutters as much, or more, when he talks slowly or in a monotone, etc., as he ever did. When that happens, he is not back where he started from—he is far behind that point. He is again a stutterer, but the taboo against stuttering has been intensified by the "speech correction" he has had. His fear and desperation are now greater than before.

Simply by making a clear differentiation between stuttering and the normal nonfluency which it is designed to avoid, such unfortunate methods and the misunderstandings from which they arise might readily be eliminated. What the stutterer needs to learn is simply that he ceases to stutter to the extent that he permits nonfluency to occur. This does not make sense, of course, until a clear distinction is made between the effort to avoid nonfluency (which effort constitutes stuttering) and non-fluency. The stutterer suffers from a semantic confusion, which he has interiorized from his semantic environment. He *identifies* nonfluency and stuttering.

It helps the stutterer greatly to observe that so-called normal speakers are nonfluent. In the absence of systematic research on the speech fluency of adults, the writer can only report his scattered observations of normal speakers, professional lecturers for the most part. Counting their repeated syllables, words, and phrases, their exaggerated hesitations, conspicuous pauses, their *uhs* and *ahs*, they tend to average from five to eight nonfluencies per minute in continuous, relatively extemporaneous speaking. For one famous lecturer, 540 nonfluencies were tabulated in slightly less than one hour. For another, 65 *ahs* were counted in five minutes. So they go. This sort of thing is normal. Stutterers generally regard it as very unreasonable, as torture even, when first instructed to speak with this much nonfluency to be performed deliberately. To them it *is* stuttering. Nevertheless, when they do speak with such deliberate nonfluency, wholeheartedly, they loosen up very considerably, speak more smoothly, stutter much less. This, of course, is precisely what one would expect if one regards their stuttering behavior as an effort to avoid nonfluency.

So far as evaluative behavior is concerned, therefore, the stutterer needs to understand the taboo imposed by his semantic environment. He needs to understand the semantic confusion involved in this taboo as he has interiorized it. *He needs to differentiate stuttering from nonfluency, and to see stuttering as his attempts to avoid nonfluency.* Stated in so many words, this may sound rather simple. In practice it involves extraordinary difficulties. The indicated alterations in evaluative behavior have to be made in the face of powerful counteract-

ing influences in the stutterer's semantic environment. It is usually very difficult to get the stutterer's parents, teachers and associates to make similar changes in their own evaluations. As a rule, they continue to praise him for speaking fluently, and to express or imply sympathy and anxiety when he does not speak fluently. Also, having learned to regard him as a stutterer, they quite automatically regard any nonfluency he may exhibit as stuttering—even though they give no heed to similar nonfluency in their own speech.

It must be realized, too, that for a stutterer to speak with repetitions, hesitations, etc., *on purpose,* is to reverse drastically long-established habits. He has been oriented for years, as a rule, to doing everything possible to keep from doing the very thing he is now being told to do. He is being asked to abandon evaluations which have come to seem natural to him. He is being asked to cultivate evaluations that strike him as contrary to common sense. Like so many other principles and practices that have been developed by modern scientific students of behavior, these, too, may appear to be very simple, but in our culture they are not easy to put into practice. Insofar as they are adequately applied, however, their value becomes evident.

VI

Overt behavior. A great deal of what might be said under this heading has already been indicated and implied. The main alterations to be made, so far as the stutterer's overt behavior is concerned, involve the deliberate performance of nonfluency, the sloughing off of certain mannerisms, grimaces, etc., and an increase in the amount of speaking and in the number of situations in which speaking is done. The primary objective of these behavior changes is to aid the stutterer in cultivating the evaluations that will lead to fearless, enjoyable, spontaneous speech—to speech of *normal* (not perfect) fluency.

In the usual case perhaps the steps to be taken would be of this order: First, it is sometimes necessary, or at least advisable, to convince the stutterer that he is capable of normal speech. This can be done by having him read in chorus with another person, even another stutterer. Strangely enough, two stutterers are, with rare exceptions, able to read aloud together without difficulty. It is also helpful in some cases to have the stutterer read and talk when alone, or perhaps to his dog, since practically all stutterers can do this without stuttering. Such practices are helpful to the extent that they counteract any assumptions the stutterer may have as to his physical inability to speak.

Second, practically every adult stutterer exhibits certain mannerisms, or so-called associated movements, such as closing his eyes, turning his head, swinging his foot, etc., while stuttering. In some cases, these mannerisms are responsible for much of the social handicap. Moreover, they can frequently be eliminated; the stutterer can rather quickly learn from directed practice, preferably before a mirror, that he can stutter without doing some of these things. The value of eliminating such mannerisms lies in the fact that the social handicap is reduced, and the stutterer's notion that his stuttering is fixed and unalterable is weakened. One must be careful, however, not to carry this too far; one must see to it that the individual understands that he is not being instructed not to stutter at all. Such an instruction would tend to strengthen the taboo with which the stutterer has to contend, and result in increased tension and discouragement.

Third, insofar as possible the stutterer should deliberately imitate his own stuttering. This should be done at first

in front of a mirror with no one present but the teacher; or, the stutterer can do it by himself provided he understands clearly what he is to do. Later, he should do it in speaking to other people. Having learned to imitate his own manner of stuttering, he should practice faking it without the effort and hurry that usually characterize it. He should do this at first while he is alone or with his teacher, and later in other situations. In doing this, the aim should be to make the stuttering entirely effortless, free from grimaces and fear—a forthright, unhurried, deliberate performance of what would otherwise be done under protest and with tension.

VII

After considerable practice in this, the stutterer is ready for the fourth step, that of adopting a streamlined pattern of nonfluency. This is not to be confused with stuttering; for the nonfluency pattern is adopted and used *instead of* stuttering. Probably a simple repetition, like 'tha-tha-tha-this,' is most preferable, partly because it was just such behavior that was originally diagnosed as stuttering and needs, therefore, to be reevaluated as normal and acceptable. However, a simple, effortless prolongation of the first sounds of words will, in some cases, prove satisfactory, although considerable practice is required in prolonging the *p* and *t*. Also, care must be exercised lest the prolonging become a complete stoppage reaction, which would be merely another way of stuttering. Having adopted, say, a simple repetition pattern, such as 'tha-tha-tha-this,' the stutterer should practice it a great deal when alone, preferably before a mirror. If a dictaphone or, better, a mirrophone is available, it is helpful to record one's speech, using the new repetition pattern, and then listen to it over and over again, in order to become thoroughly accustomed to it, and to learn to do it as smoothly and effortlessly as possible.

Gradually, then, the stutterer should introduce this pattern of nonfluency into his everyday speech, trying it out first in the easier situations and then introducing it in more and more difficult situations. He should employ it whenever he would otherwise stutter and he should also feign it liberally in saying certain words on which he would not otherwise stutter. He will find that the more nonfluency he fakes the less he will experience a tendency to stutter. This follows because his stuttering constitutes his attempts to avoid nonfluency, and to the extent that he is set to perform it, he is not set to avoid it. As time goes on the amount of feigning can be gradually reduced, since the tendency to try to avoid nonfluency (to stutter) will have been weakened, and eventually normal speech becomes possible.

What is accomplished by this means is that the individual ceases to be a stutterer and becomes instead, for a time, a rather nonfluent speaker. The unusual amount of repetition in his speech, provided it is performed wholeheartedly and without apparent effort, calls far less attention to itself than one might suppose, and is for other reasons, also, far less serious than the stuttering. One of the main reasons why it is less serious is that the repetition tends to decrease in amount with time. This is so because the voluntary repetition is performed in order to counteract the impulse to stutter (to avoid repetition or other nonfluency). But this impulse to stutter tends to become weaker and weaker, and to occur less and less frequently, as the strength of its motivation, which is the desire to avoid non-fluency, is decreased. As the inclination to stutter decreases, the need or occasion for voluntary repetition decreases correspondingly. Gradually, therefore, the individual's speech comes to be

less and less nonfluent, and tends eventually to become quite smooth. Thus, the vicious spiral of stuttering leading to more stuttering, as the individual develops a stronger and stronger set to avoid nonfluency—this vicious spiral is reversed, so that there is less and less stuttering as the individual develops a greater and greater tolerance for nonfluency. And as the threat and dread of stuttering decreases, the need for actually performing nonfluency decreases, and the individual speaks more and more smoothly.

Finally, it should be added that as the stutterer proceeds with this program he should be encouraged, even definitely assigned, to speak more and more and to enlarge the range of his speaking situations. As his evaluations of nonfluency change, he will exhibit less reluctance to speak, less of a tendency to avoid social contacts. This should be encouraged judiciously, remembering at all times that the main objective of all these measures is to help the individual to cultivate such positive evaluations of his speech as will enable him to speak without fear and tension, and with enjoyment and poise.

VIII

Physical condition. On the basis of the more adequate scientific studies done to date, there seems to be little or no reason for supposing that stutterers, as a class, have any greater need for physical hygiene than do other people. As a population generally we are not, on the average, the answer to a wise physician's prayer. Fundamental lack of good health is indicated by most of us in the condition of our teeth, the relative ease with which we catch colds, our tendency to become fatigued readily, and in various other ways. Stutterers, then, are not to be compared with an ideal population of nonstutterers who enjoy perfect health. They compare very well, indeed, with nonstutterers as they actually are found to exist with respect to their physical condition.

What might be important, however, is the possible tendency for some individuals, at least, to lack enthusiasm and to become discouraged under conditions occasioned by excessive fatigue, loss of sleep, improper diet, lack of exercise, or disease. In order to carry out effectively the sort of corrective speech program outlined above, the stutterer needs as much energy, enthusiasm, and 'good feeling' as possible. Once a stutterer has begun to change his speech behavior, the main thing with which he has to contend is the tendency to revert to old habitual ways of behaving whenever he feels tired and discouraged. From this point of view, good health is important for a stutterer.

It need only be said, in this connection, that for the most part physical hygiene involves adequate practices of eating, sleeping, exercising, working and relaxing. Beyond that, anyone is to be advised to see a doctor, and to report back sufficiently often for him to check the effectiveness of his recommendations and to forestall any serious threats of disease. So far as stuttering is concerned, it is to be said simply that, although anatomical and basic physiological matters are usually of little importance, if they are shown to be of importance in a specific case they should be given proper attention.

IX

A great deal more could be said about stuttering. The impression is not to be left that the results of scientific studies of the problem have been fully reported. Several hundred investigations of stuttering have been made and a large number of publications on the subject are available. In order to summarize, and

especially to evaluate this material, it would be necessary to write a very large book. In fact, in order to elaborate in detail the basis and the implications of the discussion that has been presented, it would be necessary to expand that discussion to the proportions of a volume of considerable size. The main purpose in the writing of this article has been to suggest one type of practical approach to the problem.[3]

In the actual carrying out of this approach, use is made of any specific techniques and of any particular manners of explanation and instruction that seem advisable in specific cases. Details of treatment depend upon the age and background of the individual, the nature and complexity of his semantic environment, the severity of the stuttering, the time available for conferences and instruction, etc. Not only are no two stutterers alike, but no one stutterer remains the same from time to time. The principles presented here, insofar as they are sound, are useful only as they are judiciously adapted to the individual and to his ever-changing state and circumstances.

[3] A concise statement of the point of view presented here is to be found in W. Johnson, "A Semantic Theory of Stuttering," in *Stuttering: Significant Theories and Therapies*, by Eugene Hahn; published by the Stanford University Press, 1943.

A TALISMAN AND A CONVALESCENCE

CARL G. GUSTAVSON
Miami University

THE students listening to their new history instructor in that eight o'clock class a few years ago could have had no idea that they were witnessing an incredible scene: that of a young man learning how to speak."

Originally, I wrote this introductory sentence as a simple statement of an unquestioned fact. Only in later rereading, did it occur to me how ridiculous such an assertion would seem to many of my acquaintances. They could scarcely have realized that I was a stutterer subject to such intense blockage of speech that at times I became nearly inarticulate. During the many years of higher schooling necessary for a doctoral degree, there had been relatively few occasions when that secret had been revealed. Yet, for me personally, the original assertion still seems a true one. This is one paradox out of a convalescence which has been such an adventure in human psychology as to underline poignantly for me certain aspects of this speech problem.

II

The convalescence had an abrupt beginning. Until I was fifteen, melioration had existed in the realm of hopes alone. I could rarely recite in class, join in conversation at the dinner table or order articles at the store without making my disability immediately apparent. At the end of my freshman year in high school I attended a speech clinic and, after a series of tests, was inducted into the art of writing with the left hand. I was given to understand that in time the speech difficulties would clear up.

The results at the clinic were good—too good. After a few days of practice in painful scribbling, my speech became comparatively effortless. Some factor other than the physiological one had become operative and gave the illusion of a miraculous recovery. Having returned home after six weeks, I continued the practice but, as will happen, there were backslidings when I used the right hand again. Upon each such occasion, my speech would disintegrate into its

former state. Once more returned to the device of my tutors, I found quick and drastic improvement. For a number of years the use of the left hand served as a magic talisman for me.

I suppose that the hope of every stutterer is to awaken some morning and find that his disability has vanished. There is just enough promise of this in his experience to make it seem possible. There are days when, for some reason, the entangling web of words trips him only occasionally. In such periods of relief, he may peer back into his other condition and puzzle over the nature of the oppressive "Presence" which so pinions him. It seems as though this "Presence," like a nightmare, is a transitory aberration which must fade and vanish. The employment of the talisman accentuated this feeling in me. Stuttering, which in its most violent form seemed as much a part of one as any obvious physiological defect, took on the apearance of an alien intrusion that could easily be exorcised. One feels that only an added will-power, some accretion of psychical rather than physical strength, should be necessary for its conquest. Yet, try as I might, I could not take this final step. I had come up against some invisible power which no strength of will seemed able to surmount.

III

In time, it became clear to me that the theory of neural dominance in itself did not explain my experiences. The drastic changes in the violence of the stuttering, the fact that some situations caused me to stutter while others did not, the groupings of responses which occurred with such unfailing regularity, all of these roused doubts. But the then high-school student lacked the knowledge of psychology which would have enabled him to discover other solutions. After all, the theory of neural dominance fits very neatly into the popular way of looking at things. Physical reasons, material causation, proof by means of such tests as can be administered, any explanation but in such a form must seem inadequate to a youth brought up in awe of the Authority of Science as interpreted by the practical-minded Midwest. In comparison, any suggestion that the stuttering might be due to interrelated "states of mind" seemed intangible and unlikely.

IV

For a number of years I could come to no intellectual comprehension of the nature of the enemy. It took a long series of observations, much groping and much repetition of experience, before I was able to break with the former attitude. Finally, late in my college years, observation of the behavior of my nervous system in certain other activities brought into focus another viewpoint of my stuttering. For instance, in bowling I might roll a score of 170 while entirely absorbed in the game. However, time after time, when someone stopped to watch me, the score would sink below 100. There was no question of a lack of learned ability or of a physiological incapacity to perform the coordinated movements. Here was an analogy of what happened in speech and with results expressed quantitatively. Another instance, an experience certainly familiar to everyone, occurred if called upon for a quick answer to a problem requiring logical thinking. Normally, the mind should reproduce the required syllogism. Instead, the self-consciousness would cause the mind to go into a chaotic whirl of disconnected ideas in which my frenzied attention was introverted upon the mental process itself. This is a close analogy of stuttering where one's whole attention is riveted on the speech process rather than on the ideas to be expressed.

Further observation revealed a number of kindred reactions. It now dawned upon me that these various reactions, all of a pattern, meant that stuttering was but the most conspicuous of a number of symptoms of a deep-lying psychological bent of my whole personality. Obviously, this bent was a result of the intense acuity of self-consciousness. (At this point, I returned to the use of the right hand with no resultant deterioration of speech.) From the vantage point of this new insight, it was possible to study one's experiences and gradually build up an understanding of the nature of my stuttering. Originally, the stammering had been only one of many manifestations of shyness but my consciousness of this socially prominent flaw had caused an introversion on the speech process which so aggravated the ailment that it became the single most powerful element in the personality.

V

The origin of the stammering, so far as I could determine, lay in the self-consciousness before other people; once stuttering is acute, however, the individual incident of a blockage occurs because of an introverted mode of thinking which, using the term in the original sense of Jung, one may call introversion. Taken in this sense, introversion is much more than a social reaction. It is an existent psychological complex, a way of observing and thinking, so rooted by habitual use and yet developed so gradually that the stutterer is unaware that his mental activity differs from that of the normal person. Furthermore, the act of thinking is so intangible in observation and so difficult to compare with those of another person that while the stutterer is only too well aware of his vocal disability he does not realize the deeper disorder from which he suffers. Even if he does possess a vague feeling that the tension and worries of stuttering are an alien intrusion, he still can not bring this mental condition into objective perspective.

In the fully established mode of introversion, the external world becomes little more than a shadowy domain whose chief importance to the stutterer is as a source from whence comes the occasion for nervous tension and the precipitation of the blockage. The real world in which one's whole endeavor is immersed is the inner world of the self. Or rather, one's attention is concentrated on that limited portion of the inner self which reflects the struggle associated with the stuttering. His being is wracked by the tension which has been built up through years of nervousness when in the presence of the stuttering situation. This condition carries with it a hyperesthetic perception of certain words or letters of the alphabet, of certain situations, of certain persons whose presence may lead to the stuttering. One wanders perpetually on the edge of the vortex of stuttering and at intervals is drawn into it. In this mode of introversion there is a rigid fixation on the procession of spoken words and upon it plays an inflamed suggestibility, in turn fed from acute memories of unpleasant experiences with this word or situation before. The details of the experience may have dropped from conscious memory but the tension instantaneously appears when suggested by the hair-trigger reaction of the memory of an intense unpleasantness.

When the stutterer speaks, he carries on dual mental processes: a cursory attempt to keep in mind the idea that he is expressing, and a deep absorption in the forthcoming string of words for any enunciation which may prove difficult. That is, he is so entirely occupied with the problem of speech that the content of his message seems detached from his concern. It seems impossible to escape

out of oneself and become engrossed in the idea one is trying to put across. If one, for a moment, is carried away by enthusiasm, no stuttering occurs. But the moment the attention flicks back to the malady, the stuttering is resumed.

VI

In my search for an escape from the "Presence," it was this dual attention which finally seemed to be the crux of the whole problem. If one could, in some way, learn how to end that fixation on the speech process and become absorbed in matters of the outer world, or the ideas out of it, the road to escape from the nightmare would be clear.

The merciless impact of the experience had built up a series of bad mental habits. Even now, if I write the word "other," a sense of strain and unpleasantness makes itself felt. Mentally, I stammer as I write it. There can be no special physical reason for difficulty with this word. It is simply the product of years of association between "other" and the stammering reaction. When I go back to the town where I spent most of my childhood, the fear rises immeasurably before the spoken word. I still cannot talk normally to former grade-school teachers. An astoundingly acute subconscious memory rises up to recreate the whole complex of childhood reactions to places and persons which I cannot for a moment recapture as I write now. Whenever I speak in Swedish, which was my childhood language but which I rarely have an opportunity to use now, my stuttering becomes violent.

In retrospect, the miraculous effect of the talisman was shown to have been the result of an association of good speech with the use of the left hand. An imaginative suggestibility, formerly occupied with the evil of the malady, had been given a more healthy direction. Even if this one aid proved inadequate in itself in conquering the tenacious habits of mind responsible for the stuttering, it did give immensely hopeful glimpses of the real potentiality in my speech. It did allay the affliction and make it possible to end the obvious vocal stuttering by studying situations and by picking strategic moments for speaking. Yet, though absorbing less energy and attention, the introversion persisted in my own mind and threatened at any moment to resume its ascendancy over my speech. The impalpable yet powerful habits of mind continued to harass me far more than any observer could possibly realize.

From the point of view of convalescence, it would have been better to have gone ahead speaking on every possible occasion. There was an all-important reason why I could not. The goal of my education was a doctoral degree in history. Scholarships, fellowships, and finally a position, go to the best prospects; and competition is so severe that one conspicuous failing will automatically eliminate one. It was better to be known as "shy and taciturn," qualities that time will remedy, than as a stutterer whose defect the public looks upon as a permanent part of the personality. Until my training was completed, I could not afford to gamble. It seemed better to sit quietly in class or at the seminar table and be content to show ability in written work. Thus, only when daily speaking became a necessity did the really crucial work of conquering the disability get underway.

VII

The long process of studying the malady was abruptly put to the test when I started full-time teaching. Would I now be able to maintain the control of my speech which I had attained in occasional teaching while in graduate school?

Would daily teaching soon erase the insidious habit of introversion?

The students in those first classes undoubtedly learned very little history. My teaching method was very bad: nearly all lecture, very little class discussion, very little personal contact. This method was certainly not premeditated but, as it worked out, very little difficulty was encountered in lecturing, while the moment I stepped down face-to-face with an inquiring student the malady returned in full force.

There were several reasons for the ease in lecturing. The superior position which the instructor occupies in the classroom engenders a new self-confidence. The compulsion of maintaining the train of thought and of thinking ahead for the next statement is in itself so strong that the introversion tends to lessen, especially when coupled with the feeling that a note-taking class seems a "thing" rather than a group of critical spectators. Enthusiasm kindled by the subject being discussed helped to bring about that absorption in "external" matters which was so necessary in order to escape the dual attention on ideas and speech process. The most important reason, probably, was the fact that public speaking was a new experience; so new that no ingrained complex of habits existed leading to introversion and stuttering. This became very apparent when compared with what happened in discussion—talking directly person to person with students. Here was the old situation of conversation and it instantly produced the habitual response.

This discovery taught me that *each specific speech situation is a separate unit*. Until now, I had persisted in regarding stuttering as a single entity which would be alleviated in all situations at the same time. But convalescence shown in lecturing was not immediately visible in other situations. Closer observation now revealed that each situation produced its own pattern of subjective states although the introverted mode of thought and the external stuttering manifestation was common to all.

In retrospect, I can recall how, as a child, the disability had spread from one situation to another. Especially vivid is the painful recollection of a day in an English class when I suddenly found that one of my "oases" of free speech, oral reading, had vanished and that I now stuttered there also. Stuttering will transfer from one situation to another depending upon the acuity of self-consciousness in the new situation. When the incubus was being built up, once a given setting had become associated with the unpleasant experience it was likely to continue to induce speech hesitancy.

VIII

The last stage of my convalescence seems to have consisted simply in *reversing the course of the spread of the introversion*. I sought out the "free situations" or those in which my speech was least contaminated by the harmful mental responses. I practiced normal speech in them until this achievement of fluent speech was self-consciously a part of me. I say "self-consciously" because I was still aware of the speech process but now it was with a sense of power and self-confidence, a sense of healing and gathering strength, which replaced the former tortured fear of every new sentence. I had finally ceased to stutter mentally as well as vocally. At an earlier time, attention on the "free situations" would inevitably have caused the transfer of the introversion to these also. Now the suggestibility was all in the opposite direction. After a time my confidence and integration were so far advanced that it became possible to apply the newly-found ability to more difficult situations

and to escape that "rigid fixation on the procession of spoken words" there also. It was almost like starting afresh, this building up of a new and integrated speaking personality where speech assumes its proper place as a tool.

IX

One word more about speech situations as separate units. According to my own experience, at least, the disability is either there in full force or is entirely missing on any given occasion. One conquers a situation *as a whole*. One does not master each individual fear arising out of a situation but rather the introversion which reflects those fears.

No three-weeks miracle is possible, naturally, as one gradually unsnarls the peculiarly knotty set of mental habits. In the classroom the fear of the blockage rarely appears now, yet at the dinner table it is often present. Even today in hours of depression after hard work or illness, the morbidity tends to express itself in the form of a return of the disability.

There might seem to have been a short-cut in this whole procedure of convalescence. Since self-consciousness seems to be the basic cause for the stuttering, why not cure this shyness by learning to be more gregarious? Why not have the stutterer force himself to associate more with other people and thus get over his fears? Excellent—if the stutterer can do this. Such a public pressure to become extroverted may have the opposite effect, however. I am very certain that one of the most consistently deleterious influences upon my speech was the adolescent public insistence on being a witty and "smooth" mixer. The extroverted values became a fixation aggravated by each new embarrassment. The stutterer is too well aware of his social role as it is. He feels himself the cynosure of all eyes looking at him curiously or pityingly while the sufferer knows all too keenly that he is being labeled as a "stammerer."

There is another way of immunizing oneself to some extent from the intensity of the self-consciousness. That is to take the attitude that the introspective mode of personality is not bad in itself and in this way to disregard the extroverted public opinion. One must learn that, Hollywood philosophy and some modern psychologists notwithstanding, the introspective mode of living a life is neither unhealthy nor morbid in itself. One must learn that the mistake lies in allowing such an abnormal fixation on a minor part of the whole purview of the inner eye. Let the person realize that some individuals, whether by heredity or by early social conditioning, are normally introspective and that they must mature their own type of potentiality. If a person can once grasp this idea and act upon it, he will create an affirmative viewpoint and a personal inner equilibrium which will go far towards rescuing him from that feeling of being abnormal which lies at the bottom of the tormenting self-consciousness.

X

The word "talisman" has been applied to the practice of transferring to the left hand. This word is used because it describes the effect upon me, not because I presume to have the right, from a single case, to form any judgment of the theory of neural dominance. The mind of the fifteen-year-old seized on a gross oversimplification of the training at the clinic and that fact itself is significant. It is one more evidence of how vividly real those ideas and "states of mind" can be which fill our consciousness and form our reactions to various facets of living. The story of my convalescence offers one evidence after another of the insistence, spontaneity, and silent effectiveness

which these exercise upon the physical apparatus of the body. The acuity of self-consciousness, the power of the imaginative suggestibility, the tenaciousness of the mental habits, the thought-mode of introversion, the individual nature of each speech situation, the role of the "free situations" in the convalescence: all of these phenomena out of personal experience underline for me, far more than any statistical data or controlled experimentation possibly could, the role of the mind in the causation and cure of stuttering.

DIAGNOSIS AND TREATMENT OF EIGHTY-FOUR CASES OF NASALITY

ARLEIGH B. WILLIAMSON
New York University

FACED with the problem of having to remedy badly nasal voices, the writer eight years ago began an experiment in diagnosing and treating all forms of this defect that came to his attention. The various types of nasality discussed in current, authoritative literature, analyses of causes, and procedures of remedy were studied. However, it was found that the diagnoses of the greater number of writers omitted pertinent characteristics present in three out of five cases reporting for treatment the first year. As the experiment progressed, these apparently-casual factors were discovered in even higher percentages. Also in the first year, it was found that, by treating these factors, the nasality disappeared in two-thirds of the cases without recourse to the remedies prescribed in the literature. Thereafter, this unorthodox procedure was accepted as a working hypothesis in experimenting with future cases, with the result that in only 5 out of 84 was it found necessary or profitable to employ the generally-accepted method of soft-palate control.

That soft-palate, or velum, control is generally advocated by writers on nasality is demonstrated in a recent study by Beighley,[1] whose comprehensive summary makes it possible for this writer to avoid quoting widely from literature on this subject. Summarizing accepted definitions, Beighley states:

> Nasality, or *rhinolalia*, is one kind of unpleasant voice quality characterized by too much or too little nasal resonance. . . .
>
> *Rhinolalia aperta* is the unpleasant voice quality resulting from too much resonance in nasal cavities that have nothing physically wrong with them. . . .
>
> *Rhinolalia clausa* is the unpleasant voice quality resulting from too little resonance or improper resonance from physically unhealthy, malformed, or obstructed nasal cavities.
>
> A combination of these two types of unpleasant voice qualities is possible if the improper functioning that causes *rhinolalia aperta* operates at the time the nasal cavities are physically unhealthy, malformed, or obstructed. *Rhinolalia mixta* describes this condition.[2]

Of accepted theories of causes of nasality, Beighley further summarizes:

> Practically all authors who discuss *rhinolalia clausa* state that it is caused by some obstruction, malformation, or diseased condition in the nasal cavity.[3]
>
> *Rhinolalia aperta* is caused, most authorities say, by improper action of the soft palate, although no one is exactly certain as to how the soft palate should work, and how much its workings differ among individuals.[4]

[1] K. C. Beighley, "What the Experts Say About Nasality," QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH, XXIX (1943), 199-206.

[2] *Loc. cit.*

[3] Beighley, *op. cit.*, p. 200.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 204.

Beighley synthesizes as follows methods of correction generally advocated:

> For *rhinolalia clausa,* a medical specialist should be consulted. He should perform whatever orthopaedic or surgical work is necessary, and the speech correctionist should finish the case by training the patient in speaking.[5]
>
> Even though authorities differ as to the nature of nasality—scope, types, causes and actual physical workings of the organs involved—almost all recommend the same corrective measures.
>
> Practically all those who discuss *rhinolalia aperta* recommend exercises of some sort for the soft palate. . . . In general, the exercises given are for getting the velum to operate properly——loosening it up, strengthening it, and training it.[6]

Of the authorities quoted by Beighley, more than two-thirds assert that the velum, in all sounds but the nasal consonants, should close the passageway into the nose.[7] A quotation from a recent work by Weaver[8] (not mentioned in the Beighley study) is representative[9] of this viewpoint:

> In only three English sounds—viz., *m, n,* and *ng*—should the soft palate hang relaxed, the lips be closed, and the vocalized breath emitted through the nose. In all other sounds, the soft palate should be raised to accomplish the closing off (occlusion) of the nasal passages.

The minority quoted by Beighley[10] assert that there may be a velar opening into the nasal chambers. The most complete analysis of this viewpoint seems to be that of West, Kennedy, and Carr:

> In ordinary conversation the nasal chambers play a very small part in resonating the vocal tones, except for the sounds [m], [n], and [ŋ]. . . . But when vocalizing with a considerable volume, the cultured speaker or singer could not perform as well with his nostrils occluded as with them open, even if his words were so chosen as to avoid all nasal sounds. There is a marked addition to his tones through vibrations emitted from the nostrils. It is as though tones from two vibrating sources were blended, as when the voices of two singers blend in such close harmony as to seem one voice. With many singers and speakers the source of this second series of vibrations, emitted from the nostrils, is probably the stretched velum. They tense the velum in its lifted position so that it serves as a diaphragm or drumhead. The air waves in the buccopharynx rebound against its under surface, causing it to vibrate and set up air waves in the nasopharynx and nares.[11]

Despite this statement, however, of the function of *the nares in the cultured voice,* the *remedial procedure* for simple nasality advanced by these same authors is:

> . . . he should elevate the velum and bring it into contact with the pharyngeal wall for the non-nasal sounds, and allow it to remain pendant only for the nasal sounds. . . .[12]

Breadth of Study

The study represents an eight-year experiment, beginning in 1936, with a total of 84 students. Five began treatment the first year, three the second, four the third, five the fourth, eight the fifth, nineteen the sixth, nine the seventh, and thirty the eighth, some students continuing instruction for more than one year, though

[5] *Ibid.,* p. 204.
[6] *Ibid.,* p. 203.
[7] *Ibid.,* p. 202.
[8] Thomas Andrew Weaver, *Forms and Principles* (1942), p. 206.
[9] Also, F. L. D. Holmes, *Handbook of Voice and Diction* (1940), pp. 120-121; Van Dusen, C. R., *Training the Voice for Speech* (1943), p. 164; Willard Wilson, "Breath Control, a Common Sense Summary," Quarterly Journal of Speech, XXVIII (1942, 339-40; Adeline Bullen, "Nasality: Cause and Remedy of Our American Blight," *Ibid.,* p. 84; G. W. Gray, and C. M. Wise, *Bases of Speech,* Harpers, (1934), p. 19.
[10] *Op. cit.,* p. 202.
[11] R. West, L. Kennedy, and A. Carr, *The Rehabilitation of Speech* (1937), p. 84.
[12] *Ibid.,* pp. 279-280. However, on page 286-7, in the discussion of *Articulatory Compensation,* it is asserted, "The so-called 'nasal twang' is not the result of the incorrect use of the velum, but seems to be due to poor resonance because of inappropriate pharyngeal tensions and improper use of the oral cavity. . . . A second approach may be made through relaxation of the pharyngeal muscles and adjustments of the jaw and tongue to produce better resonated vowels." This points to a type of nasality and method of treatment—not exposed in the general discussion of *rhinolalia*—in accord with the conclusions of this study affecting all types of nasality.

listed here for only the first year. The students, 34 men and 50 women, ranged from age 17 to 35. Sixty-three were undergraduates in New York University; the remainder were graduate students in The Jewish Theological Seminary of America. The greater number came from New York City and its immediate environs, New Jersey, Connecticut, and Long Island, although there were others from Canada, Maryland, Western Pennsylvania, Europe, and Palestine. An effort to relate diagnostic factors to ethnic or geographic cultures proved unfruitful. These 84—with the exception of 8 whose entire record was not preserved—represent all the nasality cases turning up for treatment in the courses of the investigator.

The 63 cases in New York University were diagnosed either positive or negative nasality by one or more of seven members of the Department of Speech faculty, and the diagnosis was later confirmed or modified by the writer. Each student was given a routine medical nose and throat examination and, if suspicion arose as to possible anatomical or pathological relationships, a more exacting examination by a nose and throat specialist. For the 21 theological students, there was no confirmation of the investigator's own diagnosis, beyond that of medical examinations, where needed, and occasional remarks of students or of other members of the faculty.

Method of Approach

The approach to the experiment was that of the trained singer adapting the principles and practices of singing-voice development to procedures for improving the speaking voice. Additionally, there was the background of years of general speech teaching and acquaintance with the literature on the subject.

The first step in the treatment of each student was the diagnosis of his voice as though he were a potential singer. The vocal faults were observed as those that would interfere with even mediocre singing performance, and were postulated on commonly-accepted tenets of singing-voice training: a) adequate and sustained breathing for intensity of vibration and prolonged vocal phrasing, b) freedom from constricting chest, throat, jaw, and tongue tensions, c) a fair-sized mouth opening for all vowels, d) a tongue sufficiently depressed and forward in the mouth to permit a fair-sized oral cavity for all vowels. Another theory of representative singing teachers was accepted hypothetically, that some nasal resonance may be an excellent partial quality in a good voice and that a not-too-large opening into the nasal chambers, as noted by West, Kennedy and Carr,[13] may contribute to the pleasantness of the voice.[14] Additionally, the weight of authority was too preponderantly in favor of velar control for it to be ignored as an experimental consideration.

Diagnoses

Also at the first session with each student all seemingly-relevant factors were diagnosed, and then, over a period of months, were checked, confirmed, or changed. The table on page 474 represents the completed diagnoses. Of the 68 diagnosed as *rhinolalia aperta,* all were generally nasal, not merely nasal on certain vowels. Of those 16 diagnosed originally as having insufficient nasal resonance on [m], [n], and [ŋ], extended investigation demonstrated that one had almost complete obstruction of the nasal pharynx, *rhinolalia clausa posterior,* ten had somewhat limited breathing space

[13] *Ibid.*, p. 84.

[14] Also, V. A. Anderson, *Training the Speaking Voice* (1942), pp. 120-1; Joseph P. Kelly, "Studies in Nasality," *Archives of Speech*, Vol. I, No. 1, (January, 1934), pp. 26-43; Robert Curry, *Mechanism of the Human Voice* (1940), p. 116.

in the nares as a result of enlarged turbinates, deviated septum, or small nasal passages,—listed in the chart as *rhinolalia clausa anterior*—and five had no nasal obstruction. To designate this latter group a new term was coined, *pseudo rhinolalia clausa.*

most all cases breathing was shallow, constricted, and inadequate for sustained spoken phrases, and in all but nineteen was related to tensions of parts or the whole of the vocal mechanism, from the extreme chest-collapsing tensions of fear to the more moderate of

SUMMARY OF DIAGNOSES

		NUMBER OF CASES	General vocal inadequacy	Lacking breath control	Extremely emotional	Chest and throat tensions	Tense jaw, limited oral cavity	High back tongue in all vowels	Sluggish velum	Post-operative cleft palate	Totally-blocked nasal pharynx	Partially-blocked nares	Opening mouth with upper lip	Rhinolalia mixta	Abnormally-low pitch	Abnormally-weak phonation
RHINOLALIA APERTA	*Men*	30	29	30	3	24	19	15	3	1						
	Women	38	35	38	19	30	35	22	2							
RHINOLALIA CLAUSA ANTERIOR	*Men*	4	4	4	1	2	3	1				4	1	4		
	Women	6	5	6	4	5	3					6	1	6		
RHINOLALIA CLAUSA POSTERIOR	*Men*	0														
	Women	1	1	1							1					
PSEUDO RHINOLALIA CLAUSA	*Men*	0														
	Women	5	5	5	1	4	4	1							1	4
	TOTAL	84	79	84	28	65	64	39	5	1	1	10	2	10	1	4

In the chart, *general vocal inadequacy* means absence of the effective qualities of a trained singer or speaker, listed above as *a* through *d. Narrow mouth opening* means all vowels phonated with the upper and lower rows of front teeth no wider apart than one-eighth inch, generally less, often not separated at all; *high back tongue,* the tongue just slightly lowered from the elevated position in the formation of [ŋ]; *sluggish velum,* any condition causing an overly-pendant velum, including post-operative cleft-palate, in which velar occlusion exercises were found inescapable in effecting a remedy.

Shallow breathing and tension. In al-

throat and jaw. Three-quarters or more of these students were highly sensitive, almost all were reticent, and 28 were quite fearful of social situations, such as having to speak in a class. In general, this shallow breathing and tension seemed to result in a weak voice which had to be compensated for by a strained effort to make others hear. This strain frequently resulted in a stretching of the faucial pillars and a distorting of the shape of the oral pharynx.

Muted oral pharynx and small mouth cavity.[15] Related definitely to tension

[15] J. P. Kelly, in "Studies in Nasality," *op. cit.*, p. 41, asserts, "Hence we may conclude that men with normal voices employ a wider mouth-opening than those with nasal voices, a conclusion which adds

was the habit of speaking through clenched teeth, a characteristic that seemed more specifically related to the nasality than any other, sluggish velum not excluded. The old saying, "afraid to open the mouth," certainly appeared to be true in a great many instances, although there were others with the habit who were not particularly dominated by fear. Still others with a normal mouth-opening muted the oral pharynx and practically eliminated the oral cavity as a resonator by a high back tongue. Both practices minimized the flow of vocalized breath through the mouth and, by a consequent line of least resistance, ejected an abnormal amount of it through the nose. This, together with a flat mouth aperture and a tense and distorted oral pharynx seemed to produce the nasal sound. Generally, the mouth and tongue conditions were combined. In many instances, when the student was taught in exercises and speaking to lower the jaw, the tongue would be lowered with it; in others, despite the enlarged mouth-opening, the tongue would persist in its same high position.

These two conditions were present, separately or combined, in all but seven cases of *rhinolalia aperta* and in all of the *pseudo rhinolalia clausa*. Also, they seemed related to the positive-nasality quality of all but three of the *rhinolalia clausa anterior*, for all ten of these were *rhinolalia mixta*, all having *aperta* charteristics. As West, Kennedy, and Carr say, "The diagnosis will reveal that this type of rhinolalia, characterized by distorted resonance on [m], [n], and [ŋ], is due to a partial stoppage of the anterior nares. Nasalization of the vowels and vowel-like sounds may also be present. . . . If . . . the stoppage is partial, speech training is indicated. Here the problem is limited to the elimination of nasality, regardless of whether it is the assimilation type, or simple nasality. . . ."[16]

Of the seven cases of *rhinolalia aperta* not in the closed-mouth, muting-tongue category, five—including the case of post-operative cleft-palate—were definitely diagnosed as sluggish velum. The nasality of the remaining two, remedial procedures indicated, seemed to originate in tension and general vocal inadequacy, without other apparent causes.

Of the *sluggish velum* group, the pendant character of the palate of three was related to a general apathy of body and apparent lack of muscle tone and to general over-assimilation in speech.

Four of the five *pseudo rhinolalia clausa* cases had voices so extraordinarily weak and ineffective that there seemed insufficient vocal vibration to generate nasal sounds. In the fifth, similar weakness was related to a general speaking pitch of low *a*, *b*, and *c* of the musical scale.

Related to the *aperta* characteristics of two of the *rhinolalia clausa anterior* group (who had also the closed mouth defect) was a habit of opening the mouth in part with the upper lip. Krapp says of this, "Another kind of faulty nasal speech is sometimes heard in speakers who pinch together the walls of the nose at its outlet, raising the upper lip and tightening all the muscles of that region of the face. . . ."[17]

Methods of Remedy

This experiment in nasality began in a four-year course in general voice-improvement and preaching in the curriculum of the Theological Seminary. After the voice of each student had been

credibility to the previously observed probability for women." O. L. Backus, *Speech in Education* (1943), p. 163, says, "When the jaws and mouth are habitually shut, the resulting tendency is nasality." Grant Fairbanks, *Voice and Articulation Drillbook* (1940), pp. 203-4, notes also the tongue factor, in the statement that among "the chief general causes" of nasality are "too small mouth opening, tongue elevated in the rear of the mouth."

[16] *Op. cit.*, p. 278.

[17] George Philip Krapp, *The Pronunciation of Standard English in America* (1919), p. 11.

analyzed and five diagnosed *rhinolalia aperta,* all were given general voice exercises, adapted from singing procedures, preliminary to dealing clinically with such problems as the nasality. It was presumed that the five would have to be given velar-occlusion drills; but this was delayed for a number of weeks in the interest of the entire group. Then it was discovered that the nasality of two of the five disappeared entirely during the practice of the general exercises and almost entirely in the oral reading immediately following. Concentrating on exercises and "carry-over," these two in a short time could deliver a brief classroom speech with almost no nasality, and in several months were able to speak in public and to converse without unpleasant nasal sound.

In view of this development, velar exercises were further delayed for the other three, in the hope that the general vocal training might effect their remedy. One case, in which the nasality was combined with hoarse, piercing stridency, yielded more slowly. Velar exercises were tried, but, not seeming to improve the voice in a reasonable period, were given up in favor of the general exercises, which remedied all the defects in three years.

The remaining two did not improve sufficiently without the velar-occlusion exercises, but did respond when these were tried. However, the process of carrying over to preaching and conversation the practice of elevating the velum until that became a habit was difficult and slow, taking almost four years until there was a complete, habitual remedy. In contrast, the two who yielded so promptly to the general training were recovered from the defect in less than six months.

Thenceforth, general vocal exercises were first tried experimentally in all nasality cases, and only if these did not produce almost immediate results were velar-control methods employed. Thus, the three *rhinolalia aperta* cases of the second year and the four of the third year were all remedied without recourse to velar control. Not until the fourth year, in one case, were velar exercises again found advantageous, and in one case, the fifth year. Not thereafter until the eighth year, with the enrollment of the student with post-operative cleft palate, was the velar-control method again found useful.

The first student diagnosed as having negative nasality was enrolled in the fifth year. Although her nasal pharynx was blocked by adenoids, she refused to have an operation, but insisted on taking the voice course. Though three months' training improved somewhat the quality of her voice, it left her unable to produce nasal consonants.

The remaining fifteen students diagnosed as de-nasalized, enrolled in one or other of the three final years, were subjected to the general exercises, pending developments. Of the ten cases of *rhinolalia clausa anterior,* the only difference between their treatment and that of the *rhinolalia aperta* not diagnosed *sluggish vellum* was a somewhat greater effort with the ten to develop nasal resonance (to be explained later) and to exhale into the nose some vocalized breath in all sounds. Although there is no certainty that breath actually emanated from the nostrils in any perceptible degree, the attempt improved the quality of the nasal consonants. The vowels, originally nasalized as a result, perhaps, of the *cul-de-sac* character of the partial block, under the treatment of the general resonance exercises, lost the unpleasant nasal quality, for what reason, in view of the *cul-de-sac* implication, the writer is unprepared to say. With this group, the period of response was generally longer delayed than with the

rhinolalia aperta. Also, there was a more general tendency to lingering assimilation-nasality on some vowels than with the *aperta* group. Complete cure of the two students who partly opened the mouth by raising the upper lip could not be effected until this habit was corrected.

The five cases of *pseudo rhinolalia clausa* responded more immediately and completely to the general voice development than any of the others of the study. Their basic defect was general lack of resonance, and when resonance was provided all nasal difficulty disappeared. Perhaps this correction of *pseudo rhinolalia clausa* answers the question raised by Beighley, in reference to a quotation by him of Miss C. C. Bell in which she claims that, "Lack of nasal tone is generally due to some physical defect, but it can often be remedied by the practice of the same exercises as are recommended . . . for the correction of undesirable nasality."[18] Beighley, apparently assuming that "lack of nasal tone" is the result only of obstruction, takes issue with Miss Bell, erroneously, it would seem, in view of the findings of this study, which appear to confirm Miss Bell's observations.

After the voice was generally freed from the nasality, in about 18 per cent of the cases there remained, in varying degrees, nasality on certain vowels, particularly [æ], [ɪ], [ɛ], [aɪ] (New York variety), and [ɑʊ]. In forming these sounds, the tongue seemed to have a more particular tendency to crowd back and up than on other vowels, a residual effect of the more general tendency to "mute." Further efforts to control the tongue and to form vowels correctly were remedial.

What appeared to effect a remedy, in all but the five velar-control cases, was the development of the potential resonance of the voice. This would suggest that the unpleasant nasality, represented in 78 cases, was a result, at least in part, of strain, distortion of resonators, and physiological inhibition, indicating partial resonance, confined to limited resonance areas, rather than full employment of all resonators. It suggests that what we hear as nasality is a predominance of specialized, intensified frequencies over complete general resonance. This conclusion is based on evidence that, when general strain was removed, intensity of unpleasant resonance eliminated, and the resonators relaxed and opened for vibration of sustained vowels, the unpleasant character of the nasality disappeared.

Except in the three subsequent sluggish-velum cases, after the first year no attempt was made to deal with the nasality *as such.* The nasality was completely ignored on the assumption, previously stated, that some nasal vibration contributes to a fully resonant voice. Remedial effort was concentrated on removing strain, by relaxation and full, sustained breathing, and on relaxing and opening up the oral pharynx and oral cavity so that they might serve more adequately as resonators. Usually, this meant opening the mouth or controlling and relaxing the tongue, or both. These aims achieved, if nasal sound remained, it lost its strained quality and became merely a pleasant partial in a general resonance pattern. Types of resonance other than the nasal had been made to predominate, in blending with which, a strain-free, agreeable nasal resonance became absorbed in a pleasant whole.

Whether this method was going to be effective with a particular student was generally determined in from two to four sessions, for, as soon as he was taught to relax the jaw and throat, take a deep breath and exhale a sustained [ɑ], with the mouth and tongue in appro-

[18] *Op. cit.*, p. 204.

priate position for that sound, he usually vocalized without any unpleasant nasality. From the first session, the student was required to work as consistently and conscientiously at breathing, relaxation, and resonance exercises as if training his voice for singing. So, after the fifth or sixth class session, he chanted fairly successfully the greater number of vowels and vowel-consonant combinations as successfully as with [ɑ] and read short selections with little obvious nasality. If by the sixth session he did not respond to these methods, velum-control exercises were tried.

In six weeks to two months, the student was generally able to carry over some of his improvement to speeches before the class. His principal difficulty at this point was consistency, for he was not able to get all vowels to respond as readily as some. From this stage, the procedure was largely that of making the new habits stronger than the old. Careful efforts to establish carryover in all conversation enabled some students at the end of four months to speak with no obvious nasality. Generally, a longer period was needed; but in from four to eight months most students had made the correction in conversation and, in those cases in which contact with the student was maintained for a year or more, did not later revert to the earlier nasality.

The most difficult stage of the training was the "carry-over" to conversation and, consistently, this required the longest period of practice. Conversing in a more quiet voice than when practicing exercises or reading and speaking in public, the student had to transfer to a softer tone the same practices of breath control, relaxation, and open resonators of his louder speaking. For this, a few students required more than one year.

As a check on progress, both for the student and the college (or seminary), acetate recordings were made at the beginning of the course and periodically throughout the year until the course was completed. These recorded both reading and conversation and served as partial demonstration of the conclusions here drawn, conclusions confirmed by colleagues in the Department of Speech in the cases of students with whom they also had contact, and by the Registrar of the Theological Seminary in those of theological students treated for the defect.

Exercises

The specific exercises were an adaptation of those used by the greater number of competent singing teachers to develop effective habits of breathing and resonance. Stress was laid on shaping vowels as a singer forms them, with a minimum quarter-inch (or larger) opening between the front teeth and with the tongue forward and low in the mouth.

Among the most important exercises used were those—borrowed from singing instruction—to develop nasal resonance, [m], [n], and [ŋ] in combination with vowels. Rather than to occlude the nasal chambers with the velum, the theoretical purpose of these exercises is to stretch the velum down to permit the passage of air into the nasal pharynx, and thus to develop assimilation-nasality, of a pleasant kind, in all vowels. These exercises were practiced by each student (except the sluggish velum group) presumably each day and were a part of the procedure of each class session. Their practice appears to have been part of the remedy of all cases except the one with post-operative cleft palate and the four others for whom velar-occlusion exercises proved necessary. Even with the *rhinolalia clausa anterior* group, experiment demonstrated that the voice developed better quality and became more free of unpleasant nasality with,

than without, nasal-resonance exercises, though with these cases there was a longer continuing problem of unpleasant assimilation-nasality on some vowels than with the *rhinolalia aperta* group, with whom this was no problem.

Conclusions

The following conclusions are drawn from the data of this study:

1. Exercises to "elevate the velum and bring it into contact with the pharyngeal wall for the non-nasal sounds" were found to be unnecessary except in one-seventeenth of the cases, though such practice seemed unavoidable in that percentage.
2. Tension, "muting" tongue, inhibited oral cavity, and partial, distorted resonance seemed to be major diagnostic factors in all but five of the *rhinolalia aperta* cases and partial factors in all but one of the others.
3. Practically the same vocal methods—including nasal-resonance exercises—were employed to remedy nasality, in all but six cases, as were used to correct the weak, nonresonant voice, and unpleasant nasality disappeared as general resonance developed.
4. The general-resonance methods, where effective, achieved results more rapidly than the practices of velar control where they were required, and the former were simpler and easier for the students than the latter.
5. In the *rhinolalia clausa anterior* cases, if there was breathing space in the nares, remedy—though slower—was accomplished by practically the same methods, with some difference in stress.
6. The *pseudo rhinolalia clausa* cases were those yielding most readily to the general-resonance method.
7. The literature on the subject of nasality, if this study is in any degree conclusive, seems to place too much value on remedying nasal defects by elevating the velum and occluding the nasal port, and to overlook diagnostic characteristics and remedial procedures that deserve consideration.

STAGE FRIGHT*

CHARLES W. LOMAS
Stanford University

WHEN a high-school student was asked to describe his feelings upon getting up to speak for the first time before his classmates, his answer was, "I felt as if I had drunk a lot of grease and gone and played basketball." This is more descriptive and less classical than Cicero's description of stage fright in *De Oratore,* but it represents with startling accuracy the feelings of a great many youngsters. The excitement that a mature and experienced speaker may pass off as merely a natural sensation, may cause profound discomfort to young speakers who are without the stability to deal with their feelings.

To meet this problem, the teacher needs an understanding of the psychological mechanism of fear. Such understanding, however, is useless without sympathy and common sense in applying this knowledge, and a practical program for preventing major problems and for dealing with them when they arise.

The psychological literature dealing with fear was reviewed by this writer in a previous article in the Quarterly Journal of Speech,[1] and it is not the purpose of this discussion to repeat that information. A brief review of the findings cited there will serve to orient us for an analysis of classroom procedures suitable for the treatment of stage fright.

* An article sponsored by the Secondary School Committee, Karl F. Robinson, Chairman. Ed.

[1] Charles W. Lomas, "The Psychology of Stage Fright," Quarterly Journal of Speech, XXIII (1937), 35-44.

It is now generally accepted by psychologists that the physiological conditions present in fear and other forms of strong excitement tend to energize the body and make it capable of better performance. When a speaker retains full control over all of his faculties, a better performance does occur. In acute stage fright, however, the speaker has lost control of the situation. The peculiarly *disorganized quality* of the emotion is due not to the presence of physiological changes, but to the inability of the organism to perceive clearly how to utilize them. The situation is too complex; there are too many unknown or misunderstood factors. Conflicting tendencies are set up, and instead of pursuing a single course of action with abundant energy and enthusiasm, the speaker falls into aimless movements and violent tensions.

Our problem, then, is to find ways of keeping the situation within the comprehension of the student, and of helping him to organize all of his activities toward a single goal. If this can be achieved, he will suffer no serious stage fright, but merely the temporary excitement that all good speakers know.

Some years ago, the writer participated in setting up a required course in speaking for all students in the tenth grade in a junior-senior high school in a small Wisconsin town. Since there had been no previous speech training in the system except for extracurricular activities, the opening of the program afforded an excellent opportunity of observing the reactions of students to a strange situation. In the first year, there were far more cases of stage fright than one would expect. Some students would refuse point-blank to speak at all; others would begin to speak and break down; and almost all the students approached the speaker's stand with more fear than they should have had. Cases of the first group disappeared, however, when students discovered that they could not be excused from giving the speeches by pleading excessive stage fright; and when all students clearly understood and accepted the course, even the genuine cases of stage fright decreased markedly. By the second year, except for an occasional case, usually complicated by illness or general emotional instability, serious stage fright had almost disappeared. There remained only the normal experience of every beginning speaker.

However, we must not ignore this "normal experience." Students still need help to master it. Two methods may be suggested: *prevention* through intelligent planning of the speech course; and *remedial treatment* of cases of stage fright as they arise. *It is the contention of this paper that of the two, prevention is the more important, and that intelligent planning can make remedial treatment necessary only in the exceptional case.*

II

Prevention. To prevent stage fright through careful organization of the course, the first principle to be observed is the principle of *one thing at a time.* This is based directly on the concept that stage fright is a form of disintegration. Teachers often become impatient with the multitude of deficiencies demonstrated by the beginning speaker, and burden him with all of his faults at once. The inevitable result is mental confusion. He does not know where to start. Furthermore, in many cases, he is already woefully conscious of his own shortcomings, and is in greater need of inflation than of criticism. For this reason it is better to regard the first speaking experience as a warming-up exercise in which the student knows that little or no criticism will be given. In each

succeeding appearance before the class, he may then be held for the acquisition of one new skill on which criticism will be centered. In this way the situation is kept within the comprehension of the student, and serious stage fright may often be avoided altogether.

Considerable difference of opinion exists as to what elements should be taught first. On the college level, some teachers prefer to stress delivery first, usually beginning with eye contact, and then bodily action, followed by voice training. Others prefer to begin with outlining, concentrating the mind of the student on his materials rather than on himself. At the high-school level both of these approaches are used, but a substantial body of teachers now believes in using conversation and group discussion as the first step in speaking experience. This group, whose point of view is reflected in many of the newer textbooks,[2] feels that these experiences are closer to the normal life of the student than public speaking or reading, and that they should therefore be used first.

The writer has used all of these approaches, with relatively equal results in the end product. The basis of a sound approach seems to be the simplicity of the situation as the student sees it. Even a combination of methods may retain this simplicity. For example, outlining may be taught in connection with group discussion about as well as in connection with public speaking.[3] And most students may profit by the combination of a simple outline plan to be mastered simultaneously with a simple problem in delivery.[4] So long as the particular goal to be achieved is clear to the student, and so long as he is not burdened with too much at once, good progress can be made by any of these methods, with relative freedom from stage fright.

III

The second principle to be observed in organizing a course is the principle of *motivated assignments*. Every assignment should have a definite purpose, and for the most part, one which is perfectly clear to the student himself. If intensive outlining is required, it should be made clear to the student exactly how that outlining will simplify the task of presenting the speech. If exercises in pantomime are used, the student should be told that exaggerated performance makes the normal movements of good speaking easier.

In this connection many writers urge the use of bodily action to reduce stage fright. They urge that since fear provides the body with surplus energy, the only way to get rid of it is to use it up by moving about the stage, gesturing, or even making more or less irrelevant movements.[5] This theory makes sense only if we think of bodily action as an integral part of the speech itself. It is doubtless true that movement often relieves tension, but we must remember that the essential characteristic of stage fright is that it is a disorganized response; what we want is to channel all of our activities toward a single purpose. Action can give relief to a speaker afflicted with stage fright, but only if it is

[2] Typical of recent high school texts using this approach are:
Wilhelmina G. Hedde and W. N. Brigance, *American Speech* (Philadelphia, 1942);
A. T. Weaver, G. L. Borchers, and C. H. Woolbert, *The New Better Speech* (1937);
H. F. Seeley and W. A. Hackett, *Experiences in Speaking* (1940); and H. Smith, C. E. Krefting, and E. E. Lewis, *Everyday Speech* (1941).

[3] For an analysis of the function of a discussion outline, see J. H. McBurney and Kenneth G. Hance, *Principles and Methods of Discussion* (1939).

[4] See "the sky-rocket speech" in Lew Sarett and W. T. Foster, *Basic Principles of Speech* (Boston, 1936), p. 279.

[5] "Shuffle papers, lay out your notes, brush something off the table, rearrange the furniture, set the vase of flowers out of the way, restack the books on the desk—plenty of little acts like these can be devised, and they all help." C. H. Woolbert, *Fundamentals of Speech*, rev. ed. (1927), p. 88.

purposeful, self-motivated action. The student who says to himself, "I am getting stage fright; I had better gesture," is merely increasing the complexity of the situation, and the gesture itself will be meaningless to the audience.

If bodily action is to have therapeutic value for stage fright, that value must come through training received *before speaking*, not from anything the student may do *while* speaking. Here again applies the principle of *motivated assignments*. A student may be put through various drills and exercises, pantomime, impersonation, or declamation, the purpose of which is to simplify the ultimate speaking experience. By abstracting a portion of that experience, and familiarizing him with it through drill, the instructor can train the student to react automatically and efficiently to the moods created in real speeches. But the training can have full value only if the student understands its purpose, and works toward self-motivated action.

IV

Selection of speech topics also can be motivated. In early speeches, simple topics, within the range of student experience, will reduce stage fright. More advanced topics should be reserved for later speeches. This does not mean that a series of speeches should be given on the subject, "My Trip to Aunt Minnie's," but it does mean that, if possible, the speaker should have a personal interest in and first-hand knowledge about his topic. The practical problems of school life offer an abundance of such subjects: school spirit; duties of a football manager; how to write for the school paper; how to use a power saw; how to use a calculating machine. All these topics are well within the range of the normal experience of high-school youngsters, and yet offer an opportunity for training in clear organization of ideas. And the immediacy of these subjects gives a reality to the speaking experience that materially reduces stage fright. Even in later assignments where research may be required, selection of topics related to other subjects which the student is studying may be desirable. Consultation with teachers in the social sciences and other departments will help the teacher of speech to discover such subjects, while at the same time promoting interdepartmental cooperation and increased unification of the entire curriculum.

Motivated assignments also help to create in the classroom the proper atmosphere for successful speaking. If one is teaching a required course in speech, it is always difficult, frequently impossible, to remove completely the element of coercion, particularly with the less intelligent students. But the aim should always be to persuade students to speak not because they must, but because they have something to say that they cannot leave unsaid. They should have a *wish* to speak.[6] The teacher should constantly probe the interests of the students to discover these subjects. If they can be found, the speaker will have something he wants others to know about, and half the problem is solved.

Occasionally by this means extraordinary interests are uncovered. Every teacher is familiar with the real educational value of some hobbies. The boy who is a genuine philatelist or who has an unusual collection of maps may have something to say well worth the time of the class. One high-school student who disliked speaking was encouraged by the instructor to talk about music. He had an amazing fund of information, including an intimate knowledge of the

[6] Sarett and Foster describe the "eager-to-share mental attitude" and the "speaking-for-a-cause mental attitude" as characteristic of speakers who really are free from self-consciousness. Sarett and Foster, *op. cit.* p. 63.

inner mechanism of a pipe organ. His successful experience in speaking about music carried over to later attempts on other subjects.

Thus in all of his planning of the course, the speech teacher should keep in mind that disabling stage fright may be largely prevented, first by application of the principle of *one thing at a time,* and second through adequately *motivated assignments.*

V

Remedial Treatment. Even in a well-organized course, however, some cases of stage fright will arise. The teacher must have a method of dealing with them. When a student shows signs of serious stage fright, but seems able and willing to continue, usually a friendly smile from the instructor will give him enough confidence to finish the ordeal. Public criticism should then be brief, with no reference to stage fright, and the student should be advised privately as to ways of meeting his difficulty. If a student is obviously unable to continue with a speech which he has begun, he should be advised to sit down, with the suggestion that he think further about his topic. He should then be given another chance later in the period, but the point should not be pressed if he seems unable to speak. The opportunity should be given him first at the next meeting of the class. Here too, the student should receive private criticism.

Many of these cases of severe stage fright are simply the result of inadequate preparation, sometimes without the student himself being aware of it. He may, for example, have simply memorized something that he has not made his own. The slightest distraction may destroy his set of cues, and he has not sufficient knowledge of the material to reconstruct them. Or he may have crammed his preparation into the period immediately preceding the speech class, or he may have tired himself by late hours in preparation the night before. To the student it will look as though sufficient time had been spent to insure mastery of the speech situation. But the same amount of time spread over several days would give him a far better grasp of his material and more assurance before the audience. The instructor and the student together should explore these problems so that the cause of his difficulty can be isolated and dealt with.

Adequate preparation can be assured by the device of requiring presubmitted outlines, and by requiring speeches to be delivered without notes. The purpose of the first of these measures is obvious. It enables the instructor to check preparation in advance, and it compels the student to think about his topic for a longer period of time. The second device seems at first glance to be one likely to increase stage fright, but in practice it has the opposite effect. In the writer's classes students are permitted to use notes only in the first speech. (Many elect to dispense with them there too.) Thereafter they know that they must get along without them. The result is much greater preparation of speeches, and less stage fright.

VI

Many of the most intelligent and sensitive students can be helped materially by reference to the experience of great speakers. It has been the almost universal testimony of the finest orators that they have at some time experienced paralyzing stage fright, and that they hardly ever face an audience without at least an initial sensation of acute discomfort. Even Cicero in *De Oratore* records the state of his feelings when he attributes these words to Crassus:

In my view, even the best orators, those

who can speak with the utmost ease and elegance, unless they are diffident in approaching a discourse and diffident in beginning it, seem to border on the shameless. . . . For the better the orator, the more profoundly is he frightened of the difficulty of speaking, and of the doubtful fate of a speech, and of the anticipations of an audience. . . . Assuredly, just as I generally perceive it to happen to yourselves, so I very often prove it in my own experience, that I turn pale at the outset of a speech, and quake in every limb and in all my soul.[7]

William Matthews cites the experience of dozens of English and American speakers in his chapter entitled "The Orator's Trials."

It is well known that Erskine, the great forensic advocate, was at first painfully unready of speech. So embarrassed was he in one of his maiden efforts that he would have abandoned the attempt to harangue juries, had he not felt, as he tells us, his children tugging at his gown, and urging him on, in spite of his boggling and stammering. Sheridan and Disraeli, as all the world knows, "hung fire" in their first speeches, and Curran was almost knocked down by the sound of his own voice when he first addressed his "gentlemen" in a little room of a tavern. The first speech of Cobden, also, who became afterward one of the most powerful champions of the Anti-Corn-Law League, was a humiliating failure.

It is said that Canning was sure of speaking his best if he rose in a great fright. To feel his heart beating rapidly, to wish the floor would open and swallow him, were signs of an oratorical triumph. At a Mayor's dinner in Liverpool, he was so nervous before he was called on to speak, that he twice left the room in order to collect his thoughts.[8]

Matthews also cites the experience of many other distinguished speakers, including such Americans as Tristam Burgess, Patrick Henry, Rufus Choate, and Daniel Webster. We might add such familiar names as William Jennings Bryan, George Arliss, and Mme. Schumann-Heink. The facts are that stage fright, in moderate form at least, is a virtually universal experience. Realizing this, the intelligent student will adapt himself to it and learn to use it. He will thus grow in speaking power through the stimulation which, misunderstood, would unnerve him and destroy his effectiveness. Booker T. Washington describes vividly how the stimulation of the speech situation affected him. After discussing the nervousness which beset him before speaking, he says:

There is a great compensation, though, for this preliminary nervous suffering, that comes to me after I have been speaking for about ten minutes, and have come to feel that I have really mastered my audience, and that we have gotten into full and complete sympathy with each other. It seems to me that there is rarely a combination of mental and physical delight in any effort as that which comes to a public speaker when he feels that he has a great audience completely within his control. There is a thread of sympathy and oneness that connects a public speaker with his audience, that is just as strong as though it was something tangible and visible.[9]

By hearing the experiences of great speakers, students can be made to realize that there is nothing pathological about their excitement before speaking, and thus to understand and master the emotion.

Many students may be helped in the classroom situation if the instructor will devote the first few minutes of each speaking period to group exercises in relaxation, breathing, and bodily action, or vocal control. These exercises release tensions and give the student a better start on his speech. Of these, only deep breathing can be used by the student as a preliminary to an actual speaking situation, but the student may find ways

[7] Cicero, *De Oratore*, I, xxvi, translated by E. W. Sutton (Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1942).

[8] William Matthews, *Oratory and Orators* (Chicago, 1879), pp. 144-145.

[9] Booker T. Washington, *Up from Slavery* (1902), pp. 242-43.

of using some of the others before he appears on the platform.

VII

Finally, students should have it impressed upon them that they must think constantly about the idea they have to convey and the people who comprise the audience, rather than about themselves. Hollingworth quotes the fable of the centipede:

A centipede was happy quite
Until a frog in fun
Said "Pray, which leg comes after which?"
This raised her mind to such a pitch,
She lay distracted in a ditch,
Considering how to run.[10]

The speaker who thinks primarily about himself rather than about the audience and his subject will have a similar experience. A student in a college night-school class failed utterly to respond to any of the devices mentioned here. Time after time she would get up to speak, and leave the platform, sometimes in tears and always in obvious distress. After trying all the conventional approaches, the instructor finally in unacademic anger told the girl that she was a disagreeable, self-centered little nuisance, and that she would do him a favor by following her expressed desire to get out of the class. The girl, however, returned the following week and completed her first speech of the course. Thereafter she had no more instances of hysteria. This is an obviously pathological case, and the instructor's method of dealing with it unorthodox and of dubious general application. This writer does not recommend it. But we can often learn much from a study of the extremes, for the more moderate forms of emotional distress are often related in kind to the pathological varieties. A student who remains objective in his approach to his subject and his audience will not experience unbearable stage fright.

Some of the newer high-school texts do not mention stage fright at all. Perhaps this is just as well. If the course is well planned and carefully taught, there may be little serious stage fright among students. Calling attention to it in print may merely magnify the universal tensions of speakers, rather than alleviating them. What stage fright of a serious nature does occur can be handled by conference with the instructor. Meanwhile the emphasis can be put upon the positive suggestion of confidence and self assurance, and upon the objective attitude. Intelligent teaching is the real secret of freedom from stage fright.

[10] H. L. Hollingworth, *The Psychology of the Audience* (1935), p. 206.

WHAT IS A SPEECH TEST?*

FRANKLIN H. KNOWER
State University of Iowa

Introduction

THE parallel development of programs of speech education and the science of educational measurement during the last 25 years has aroused the interests of many teachers of speech in the possibilities of measuring achievement in speaking. There is a steadily growing body of research literature which reflects these interests. A considerable body of this literature has been well reviewed by Gilkinson.[1] These research reports, however, are primarily devoted to the analysis of a series of specific

* An article sponsored by the Secondary School Committee, Karl F. Robinson, Chairman. Ed.

[1] Howard Gilkinson, "Experimental and Statistical Research in General Speech," The Quarterly Journal of Speech, XXX (1944), 95-101, 180-186.

problems, and often presume a body of knowledge about testing methods and principles which the typical classroom teacher does not possess. The number of inquiries about speech testing received by the writer over a period of years has convinced him that teachers are interested in these principles. It is with the hope of throwing some light on the application of the principles of testing to speech education that this article is written.

Test Values

Testing is a fundamental part of educational method. In the typical classroom, a test is administered at the end of a unit of instruction to enable the examiner to evaluate the extent of learning. It is commonly assumed, although sometimes erroneously, that students who do best on the test have learned most in the course. A preferable educational procedure involves comparing results on a pretest with an end test. The pretest is occasionally used as a method of determining the nature of the instruction to be given in the course. In some cases where the course objectives and content are rigidly prescribed, students are excused from required work, or given course credit without taking the course, when they demonstrate by test achievement that they can meet the standard. Testing is also a necessary technique for the study of the comparative values of teaching method. When properly done, it is conductive to the development of more responsible teaching. It contributes to clarification of our knowledge about speaking, to refinement and validation of objectives, and it may operate as an incentive to learning. An incidental value to the field may be found in the persuasive significance of program recommendations when couched in relatively exact and quantitative terms. The basic purpose of all testing is to increase the accuracy of evaluation and description by refining measurement. The general importance of this aspect of teaching method is certainly sufficiently great to warrant careful study of its principles.

Fundamental Problems

The teacher of speech who sets out to measure achievement in speaking is at once confronted with many difficulties. Speech is admittedly a complex activity. The individual speaker's proficiency in all processes which contribute to the total success of his speech is seldom if ever consistent. The values of the various processes for accomplishing different purposes may not be the same. The effects of speech will vary with the ability and standards or tastes of listeners. The level of achievement in various processes influences the effect as a whole in a different manner from speaker to speaker and situation to situation. That is, at times skill in some processes may operate to offset defects in other processes, and at times skill in several processes may be completely negated by a single fault. Since speech operates primarily as a means of social interaction, social responses are of great significance as test results, and listeners commonly respond to the speech act as a whole. Although the teacher should learn to respond analytically to the performance of the student, it must be remembered that this type of response is not characteristic of the average listener. Are these inherent difficulties insurmountable in speech testing? Perhaps we can answer this question more accurately after we have reviewed briefly some of the main characteristics of good testing.

Up to this point we have used the word "test" in the broad and rather general manner of its popular interpretation. As we shall see later, that is probably the best way to use the word. The more common use of the word in educa-

tion implies a paper-and-pencil project to which a specific grade or score is assigned by a test scorer. The student thinks of this mark as indicating that he passed or failed the test. But all tests are not of this paper-and-pencil type. Speech tests in the classroom and clinic, or in life, commonly are speaking projects. The Bible gives us a record of a type of speech test used in early times:

> If he said, Nay; Then said they unto him, Say now Shibboleth: and he said Sibboleth: for he could not frame to pronounce it right. Then they took him, and slew him at the passages of the Jordan: and there fell at that time of the Ephraimites forty and two thousand.
>
> —Judges XII:6

Early tests in the field consisted primarily of outlines for classroom criticism. The teacher decided on the basis of whatever criteria appealed to him whether the student passed the test. No one knows how many Ephraimites have fallen by their judgment.

A test, defined in its simplest terms, is a prescribed activity attempted under controlled conditions. Some tests function as measuring instruments, and some do not. For a test to serve as measurement its results must be subject to exact and quantitative description. One must understand that the mere attachment of numbers to a test does not make it a measuring instrument, for numbers are merely abstract symbols that must be interpreted, and they do not always mean what they may seem to mean. Scratching numbers from 1 to 12 on a short stick does not make it a foot ruler. Neither does the arbitrary assignment of numbers to a test paper. Because most achievements in speech vary in amount, as do other products of learning, a very practical problem in speech testing is that of converting tests into useful measuring instruments. As we proceed we shall discuss this problem in greater detail in connection with various others.

Some tests that can be used successfully for purposes of measuring general achievement do not operate successfully as instruments for diagnosis. Diagnostic testing, on the other hand, may provide at the same time a basis for testing achievement. If garden peas do not grow successfully in my garden I have evaluated that soil for garden peas. I have not diagnosed (or analyzed) the soil to learn why peas do not grow successfully. Likewise, a short speech performance under standardized conditions may not secure a desired response, but in this case the little learning that any intelligent person may have about speech often leads him to jump to conclusions about the causes of failure. Teachers interested in exact analysis of speech problems, on the other hand, will use testing procedures that enable them to diagnose difficulties as well as to evaluate achievement. The manner of handling this problem is, in fact, one of the most important differences between the well-trained and the untrained teacher of speech.

Diagnostic testing is concerned with secondary or contributing processes, and requires much more detailed analysis than does achievement testing. When only a general evaluation is needed, the achievement test more quickly serves the purpose. The teacher must have a very clear idea of what the process measured by the diagnostic test contributes to the activity as a whole, and avoid unwarranted interpretation of such tests as tests of speech. They may be realistically identified only as tests of speech processes. Tests of oral English, articulation, organization, and social attitudes illustrate the type of test to which we refer as diagnostic in nature.

Test Criteria

The first step in the use of a test is the evaluation of the test itself, for test

results can only be interpreted in terms of what is known about the test as such. On any test, the first criterion is *reliability*. And reliability is that quality in a test which enables us to measure *consistently* whatever we measure. If a rater scores the speeches on a set of records one way at one time and differently at another time, the extent of his unreliability as a judge may be determined by computing the index of reliability of his ratings. When the scores of two raters are averaged, the degree of agreement between raters may be used as a basis for determining the reliability of the combined rating scores. Ambiguously defined speech processes or skills produce ratings of low reliability.

Specifically defined processes may be rated with a high degree of agreement. Reliabilities are always relative, and for this reason scores based on small samples of processes tested, and secured under conditions where differentiation is difficult because of a narrow range of achievement, are ordinarily less reliable than scores based on a larger sample and secured from individuals representing a wide range of achievement. So-called objective tests with a few items are ordinarily less reliable than tests with a larger number of items because of the differences in the number of samples used to measure achievement. This is another reason why achievement testing in speech is such a difficult problem. There are many processes to be measured, and each process must be sampled with enough items or observational time to produce a reliable index. Unless sufficient time is taken to secure such samples the score is worthless. To take the needed time often violates another practical principle, that of demanding economy of time in testing.

A second important criterion of a test is its *validity*. If tests of speech achievement do not actually measure speech achievement, they are invalid. For this reason it is particularly important to avoid confusion of part with the whole. This is not to deny the value of part tests in their own right and when given proper consideration for their place in the act of speaking as a whole. In fact, it is only by reliable measurement of such part-processes that we can determine their contribution in the total act. Of course, one may evaluate speech strictly in terms of achievement in a particular process. If one teaches a speech course in which language skill is the sole objective of training, then by definition speech is merely the use of language. But then if speech fails as a result of some other limitation, the teacher must accept the responsibility for his unrealistic analysis of speech.

Tests are sometimes validated by correlation with an existing test of the same skill. If the tests agree, the value of the new test must still be determined on other grounds. Why create a new test if an available one provides an acceptable index? If the tests do not agree, the validity of either or both tests may be called into question. On the other hand, the tests may produce comparable scores although neither is a valid test of its objective. The correlation of the ratings of one speech critic with another does not make the ratings valid if both are highly biased. The most important measure of validity is the ability of a test to differentiate individuals or groups already known, from objectively derived data other than test scores, to be characterized by differences in the trait or process being measured. To find such indices in a field such as speech is not easy. Often a process of item analysis is used to eliminate the items from a test that do not contribute to the differentiation desired in the composite test score. This process of test analysis is known as item validation.

Tests are also evaluated in terms of their *purposes* or *significance*. A poor measure of an important process is better than a good test of something trivial. The importance of what is tested can be determined by factor analysis of the part it plays in the complex speech pattern.

Tests should be given only when they serve an important purpose. When tests are given their scores should be used. Other things being equal, the more *economical* the test in original cost, student time, and time necessary for scoring and interpretation, the better the test. Moreover, the test must be useful for the evaluation of the population to which it is administered. In most cases this means that it must facilitate the differentiation of the members of the population studied. *It must not be too easy or too difficult.* In either case it will fail in its function of differentiation.

In administering and interpreting test scores, a standardized procedure should be adopted. In student speaking, for example, the same time, testing environment, and type of speaking or test materials should be used for all subjects. Raw scores on a test should be converted into percentile scores, and the percentile scores should be based on a representative sample from a comparable population. Only by using such means of evaluating raw scores are the abstract numerical terms given an exact meaning.

Observational Tests

There are four major types of testing procedures used in speech education. The order in which they are listed here has no special significance.

The most commonly used method of testing may be called *the method of observational evaluation*. "Observation" in the sense used includes hearing as well as seeing. This procedure may be used both for general evaluation and diagnosis. Symonds[2] has indicated that effectiveness of observational evaluation is influenced by such characteristics of the observer as efficient sensory capacities, capacity for alertness and concentration, knowledge of what to look for, and the capacity to make fine distinctions. Other needed qualities include freedom from strong bias or prejudice, freedom from fatigue and other distractions, the ability to interpret what is observed, and the ability to record observations quickly.

Observational evaluation may be carried out introspectively, by an ordinary listener or listeners who pool ratings, and by an expert critic. While self-analysis of achievement is an important aim in teaching, considerable skill is necessary in order to attain a useful degree of objectivity in self evaluation. We must not confuse a series of introspective check questions with objective evaluations. Where such questions are used to assist in formulating educational goals a well-trained critic should assist the student in his self-analysis. The evaluation rendered by an expert is more apt to be reliable than the evaluation of the untrained critic. However, since the function of the critic is to evaluate performance in terms of known standards demanded by discriminating listeners, he should occasionally validate his evaluations, against the critical standards of others. The larger the number of typical listener ratings averaged to determine an evaluative index of performance, the more reliable such ratings are apt to be. Economy of effort in evaluation warrants limiting the number of raters in any project to that number above which the adding of additional raters does not appreciably increase the index of reliability.

Three ways of rendering observational evaluation are the intuitive, the analyti-

[2] Percival Symonds, *Diagnosing Personality and Conduct* (1931), Chapter One.

cally systematic, and the instrumented. Although the intuitive method is often hasty, biased, and whimsical, it may be as accurate for general evaluation if carried out by socially and intellectually sensitive persons as is the more analytical type. The diagnostic values of such evaluation are seldom dependable.

The more analytical and systematic type of observation is usually carried out with the use of a rating scale, or check list. There is no evidence that experienced observers improve their evaluations by use of such scales. They serve such purposes as a guide for the training of inexperienced observers, a convenient form for recording judgments, and a record of the observational evaluation rendered. They also provide a useful means of studying evaluational judgment and analyzing speech performance. Much of the criticism against such scales as evaluational instruments, as we shall explain later, should be more properly directed against the process of rating by the person using the scales. It is essential that the rater thoroughly familiarize himself with any scale before attempting to use it in test situations. If the scale is to work well, the rater must use it easily. If he cannot do this, the accuracy of recorded evaluation is bound to suffer.

To enable the rater to use a scale conveniently it should not contain too many items. The total number of items will depend upon the length of the observation. Moreover, terms used in the scale must be precise and meaningful to the observer. The rater should not attempt to discriminate more than five to seven degrees of difference in traits rated. The attempt to discriminate finer degrees of difference results in a false sense of refinement in the process of observational evaluation.

No attempt will be made here to present a comparative evaluation of various types of scales in use. Most of them provide weighted scores for various items, and some add an overall item of *General Effectiveness* on the assumption that the evaluation of the performance as a whole demands consideration both of achievement in the separate processes and in the coordinated total performance. The whole cannot be more or less than the sum of the parts if the whole is evaluated as one of the parts. Graphic scales permit the drawing of speech profiles. Check lists are seldom used to provide numerical records of performance. The rater checks the item if it is to him significant, and omits the check if it is not pertinent. The publication of norms for a rating scale add little to the usefulness of the scale as such.

The objectivity of observational evaluation is entirely a matter of the objectivity of raters. Although the standards of evaluation in this process are ostensibly subjective it remains a fact that such judgments may be accurate or even more accurate than an arbitrarily assigned score derived from items on an objective paper and pencil test. The conscientious rater will remain constantly alert to factors that influence the quality of his judgments and make every effort to exercise them with care. The *halo effect* in rating involves the tendency to generalize about speech achievement as a whole in terms of the critic's reaction to one or more of its factors. This tendency in rating, when ratings are used merely for general evaluation, is not wholly to be deprecated. Since listeners ordinarily react to a speech performance as a whole, the critic should not always studiously avoid the influence of the halo. However, if ratings are to be diagnostic, then the best of discriminative judgment is needed.

Ratings on the average tend to fall above a theoretical average, although there are marked differences among raters in the central tendency of their

ratings to be above or below the mean. Raters also differ in the range of their scores, although there is a general tendency to avoid use of the extremes on a scale. There is also a danger, in observational evaluation, that optimism or pessimism will cause the finding of achievement, or lack of it, because one looks for it or would like to find it. Some studies of comparative method in teaching where observational evaluation has been used have not guarded against this source of error.

The intuitive and systematized observational methods of evaluation are both based on direct observation. An indirect method of observation in the form of recordings, films, and laboratory records is also available. This method may improve evaluations under some circumstances. These devices preserve records of performance for repeated and more detailed observation, they may vary the form of the stimulus under observation as is done when the language of a speech is written down, and they enable the separation of some parts or processes from others for more specialized analysis. Although such an analysis is useful for diagnosis and for research, it should be remembered that what is evaluated under these circumstances is not a complete and realistic reproduction of speech, but only certain remains of it. The analysis of particular processes in this manner is never complete until they are also evaluated in relationship to other processes and to the whole dynamic act of speech.

Objective Testing

Objective type tests of processes which operate in, or influence, the speech act may be likewise used as instruments of evaluation. In this classification we may include those tests of the student's knowledge of facts and principles about speech, which form the content tests for most academic courses. But such tests are not strictly tests of speech achievement. They may be useful tests of speech-course achievement. To evolve a test of speech achievement, it would be necessary to combine tests of many speech processes in a battery, and to determine an appropriate unit score. Assuming that test scores on adjustment tests, language tests, information tests, reasoning tests, voice-usage tests, etc., could be combined to form a unit score we still should have only a score on certain speech processes. Each of these tests should be reliable and valid as independent tests. This means they should be tests of substantial length. No doubt many other specific processes than those named should be included in such a battery.

The conclusion must be that such a battery would be far too expensive and time consuming for practical purposes. Moreover, they still test only speech processes, and not the living integrated act of speech as such. One may even make the point that such tests are not necessarily objective tests. Somebody selected the items for the test, somebody decided how the items are to be scored. The conclusion is that the so-called objective speech test has many limitations. Its chief values lie in its use for purposes of special diagnosis, the validation of observation, and as an instrument of research in speech education. The values of such tests for these purposes are not to be minimized.

Pragmatic Tests

Another type of test by which speech achievement may be evaluated is the test of the effects of speech upon the listener. No one can deny that if a speech accomplishes its purpose, it is an effective speech. We can measure listener comprehension, retention, attitude change, and some changes in his activity. Group balloting, ratings of the speaker, audience

meters, audience photography, and observation or ratings of the audience may also be used as indices of the achievement of the speaker. Tests which measure speech achievement by this method are primarily instruments of evaluation rather than diagnosis. If the speech succeeds, we may not know why. If it fails, it may have been the result of various causes. Moreover, reliable tests of this type are exceedingly cumbersome for classroom use, and even less adapted to general audience use. For practical classroom purposes it imposes an exceedingly difficult standard upon the student speaker. He may learn far more from work with a speech upon a difficult subject and for a complex purpose than from work with an easy subject in a simple situation. If this test were used exclusively it would discourage exploratory or experimental activity on the student's part. Again, the value of such tests as measuring devices is primarily in what they contribute to our knowledge about speaking.

Evaluational Techniques

For years psychiatry and clinical psychology have worked with the method of clinical diagnosis. Observation in standardized test situations, case histories, and interviews have provided the basis for evaluations. Modern educational science has developed the techniques of constructing, using, and interpreting specialized tests. The modern personnel worker has combined the best of these methods and added others of his own devising to produce the personnel method for evaluation and diagnosis of achievement. This method of testing speech achievement makes use of data for all three other major types of speech tests that we have discussed in this paper. All possible pertinent data are collected from every available source. Such data are usually placed on an accumulative record form and are then carefully studied to note their consistency and supporting evidence as well as their inconsistencies.

The evaluation of the student's achievement becomes a matter for expert interpretation and a critical judgment on the student's achievement. In a complex activity such as speech this technique has much to recommend it in preference to any of the methods previously reviewed. A unit score on achievement is thus attained without the difficulty of attempting to combine scores. To the charge that such evaluation is subjective it can be said that it need be no more subjective than the evaluations and diagnosis of the doctor of medicine.

The teacher who makes such an evaluation is in a position to counsel the student and direct his educational activities in a personal manner. To be sure, the teacher must have more comprehensive and exacting education than is needed to hand out a test score. But the task is not insurmountable, and the difficulties of the task are not an excuse for failure to use the best possible methods.

Conclusion

What is a speech test? Our answer is that it is the expert use of a great variety of data derived from sound tests, observation of speech performance under controlled conditions, and a review of records of interests and achievements to formulate a critical judgment on the speaking proficiency of the student. To be a speech test, it must measure the achievement of the individual in many speech processes and the integrated use of these processes in functional speech activity. None of the processes must be confused with the whole, and the test should be diagnostic as well as evaluative. To accomplish such results is more than can be expected from any paper-and-pencil device or laboratory gadget.

It requires knowledge of speech, testing methods, a mature sense of speech standards, and the ability to coordinate all these factors in an objective evaluative judgment. This concept of the speech test is offered as a realistic and practical one because of its similarity to and scientific refinement of the method in use by the layman in his everyday reaction to the speech of his associates.

As no air-pump can by any means make a perfect vacuum, so neither can any artist entirely exclude the conventional, the local, the perishable from his book, or write a book of pure thought, that shall be as efficient, in all respects, to a remote posterity, as to contemporaries, or rather to the second age. Each age, it is found, must write its own books; or rather each generation for the next succeeding. The books of an older period will not fit this.

Yet hence arises a grave mischief. The sacredness which attaches to the act of creation, the act of thought, is transferred to the record. The poet chanting was felt to be a divine man: henceforth the chant is divine also. The writer was a just and wise spirit: henceforth it is settled the book is perfect; as love of the hero corrupts into worship of his statue. Instantly, the book becomes noxious: the guide is a tyrant. The sluggish and perverted mind of the multitude, slow to open to the incursions of Reason, having once so opened, having once received this book, stands upon it, and makes an outcry if it is disparaged. Colleges are built on it. . . . Meek young men grow up in libraries, believing it their duty to accept the views which Cicero, which Locke, which Bacon have given; forgetful that Cicero, Locke, and Bacon were only young men in libraries when they wrote these books.

Hence, instead of Man Thinking, we have the bookworm.

RALPH WALDO EMERSON, *The American Scholar* (1837)

Three other persons have also been relied on so heavily for editorial assistance that their names might properly have been listed as Associate Editors:

Bower Aly, in addition to himself having been a frequent contributor, opened avenues through which came six articles on public address.

Russell H. Wagner, Editor of *Speech Monographs,* for the entire three years has forwarded all manuscripts coming to him that seemed to be more properly suited to the purpose of the JOURNAL. In fact, publication in this issue of the especially significant article on, "Diagnosis and the Treatment of Eighty-four Cases of Nasality," by Arleigh B. Williamson was made possible by Professor Wagner's courtesy. The article was scheduled for publication in the *Monographs,* prevented by lack of space from being published this year, and was released to the JOURNAL rather than being held over for the next annual issue of the *Monographs.*

Finally, Wendell Johnson, Editor of the *Journal of Speech Disorders,* has repeatedly supplied the JOURNAL with articles on speech disorders, not to mention having frequently himself written articles. The furnishing of articles from his editorial supply was a courtesy that unhappily we could not reciprocate, but which we appreciated, and from which our readers benefited.

W. N. B.

NEW BOOKS

LOREN D. REID, *Editor*

Training the Voice for Speech. By C. RAYMOND VAN DUSEN. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1943; pp. ix + 222. $2.00.

This work is the third of the McGraw-Hill Series in Speech under the editorship of Clarence T. Simon. About half the book is devoted to textual material, and the other half to exercise material. About one-third of the textual material concerns basic considerations of the machinery used in voice production; the other two-thirds of the textual material is devoted to basic theory of voice training. The exercise material is divided about equally between technical vocal exercises and literary borrowings (most of them poetical) intended as practice material for the student.

The book is intended for the use of those who have had little previous voice training or who have had incorrect vocal training. Though the author does not so state, one gathers from the illustrations and exercises that the work is intended for adolescents and adults. It is intended as a class text or as a manual for individual use.

The basic considerations of voice science are presented simply and stated as accurately as the complex factors of vocal anatomy, physiology, resonance, and acoustics can be presented when they are simplified.

The body of material on basic theory of voice training is a well-balanced portion of the book, apparently written with great care after diligent study of the literature of the field.

The technical exercises included in this book are varied, sound, and sensible. This material avoids as much as possible (and more than most voice books) the special pedagogical tricks and inventions that depend for their effectiveness upon the personality of the teacher who originated them.

Some of the books on voice training now offered to the public consist largely of gleanings from literary sources tied together by inadequate and sketchy paragraphs of textual material. They remind one of a motion picture production in which some musical artist displays his talents in the framework of a "plot" so thin that if the operator got the reels mixed the audience would not discern the difference. Van Dusen has devoted less than one-fourth of his pages to this material from literary sources. There are those who may charge that with most of this material there is no uniqueness of application—that the passages selected for practice in one section could as well be used with another—and that the student could easily find in standard collections of literary gems material as useful for his purpose as that offered by Van Dusen. In short there are those who might claim this material to be "padding." But since it is obvious that this book has a sturdy and well designed chassis, perhaps we should allow Van Dusen to adorn it with his favorite and tasty upholstery.

ROBERT WEST,
University of Wisconsin

The Theatre Book of the Year: 1942-1943. By GEORGE JEAN NATHAN. New York: A. Knopf, 1943; pp. vii + 296. $3.00.

Although the theatrical season of 1942-1943 was, on the whole, a very poor one, George Jean Nathan chose it as the starting point for "a projected series [of books] whose aim is a statistical record and critical interpretation of the plays produced annually in the American theatre." This prospectus, by the way, wants prompt annotation. The "American theatre" turns out to be those theatres which are in the Broadway area of New York City, plus a few, a very few, located in other parts of Manhattan, but all within the borough. The "statistical record," which includes tables, dates of opening in New York, casts, and the usual program time-and-place notes of the act divisions, is not full enough to establish the book as a competitor to those of Burns Mantle. Students of theatrical history may also be interested in his "Honor List," citing what he deems the best full-length American play, the best short American play, the best farce, musical show, revival, male acting perform-

ance, female ditto, director, scene-designer, and the other items common to such lists. For good measure, he throws in another list, headed "Especially Interesting Performances."

What we have here is another book of criticism by George Jean Nathan, the twenty-second according to the list of previous works published on the fly-leaf. It is a collection of essays, running from two to three pages each in length, discussing productions which appeared in New York in the season of 1942-1943, on things relating to the theatre and suggested to the author by one or another of these productions. In his foreword to this first volume of the series (the second will also have appeared some weeks before this review), Mr. Nathan assures his readers that the essays therein are not simply reprints of his current reviews published throughout the year, although some of that material has been used where it fitted the purpose and character of the book and where revision was therefore needless.

The book will do nothing to lessen Mr. Nathan's reputation as a severe and exacting critic. For every play or performance which wins approval, there must be ten or twenty others that are thoroughly and with veteran skill reduced to dust. This characteristic of the work prompted one commentator to protest that the theatre could not possibly be as bad as Mr. Nathan made out, or nobody would go to it. Discounting a certain amount for the vehemence of Nathan's Early American Mercury style, and, if you will, a fairly consistent indifference to any sociological bases for criticism, the conviction mounts that he is right in the substance of his judgment and in the principles upon which this judgment is based. The book is one long protest against shoddiness, shabbiness, pretensions either physical or intellectual, lack of imagination, stereotyped work, bad craftsmanship in any of the divisions of production. He resents such tendencies as the shameless capitalization of patriotism to cover artistic deficiencies. In essence this volume, like all others, is a persistent demand for certain qualities: intelligence and honesty in the treatment of material and technical expertness in handling the medium. This demand motivates at once such sound thrashings as that given to *Yours, A. Lincoln,* or *The Morning Star,* or the careful winnowing of virtues and faults in the discussion of *The Patriots,* or his approval of *This Is the Army.*

Ross Scanlan,
College of the City of New York

Debating in the Colonial Chartered Colleges, an Historical Survey, 1642 to 1900. By David Potter, with a foreword by George A. Kopp. Teachers College, Columbia University, Contributions to Education, No. 899. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1944; xiv + 158. $2.25.

Before a definitive history of speech training in America can be written, our graduate departments will have to complete a score or more of carefully prepared topical monographs such as David Potter's *Debating in the Colonial Chartered Colleges* and previous studies by Guthrie, Fritz, Robb and a few others.

This study is much broader both in the number of colleges and in the period of time considered than Ota Thomas's, for example, yet the scope is narrow enough to permit detailed topical discussion of data from each of the nine colleges. The author has surveyed debating in its broad sense as the oral discussion of controversial problems as it evolved in four forms: syllogistic disputation, forensic disputation, the literary and debating society, and intercollegiate debating. Each form is studied in roughly parallel topics concerned with the background and origin of the form, the procedures, the subjects and subject-matter debated, together with the factors involved in the decline of each of the first three forms. The origins, procedures, and subjects are presented in detailed comparisons not hitherto found in one volume. In the chapters on syllogistic and forensic disputations some confusion results from failure to arrange illustrative lists of theses so that the quantitatively dominant trend in types of thesis-subject appears as clearly to the reader as to the author. The discussions of factors in the origin and decline of disputations and of the debating societies are broadly conceived but neither unexpected nor new.

The accounts of the origins of forensic disputations in English and of the debating societies and their practices are the most coherent that have been published. The author notes especially interesting conflicting trends in the later eighteenth and early nine-

teenth centuries toward both written, *memoriter*-delivered disputation and extempore preparation and delivery. The former trend may yet be seen in Yale debating. At Harvard in 1831 *extempore* meant *impromptu* whereas at Dartmouth it meant at least one or two weeks' notice of the proposition to be debated. Similar differences could have been observed in the intercollegiate debates of the two colleges as late as 1942.

It is easy for histories to be supercharged with "great men." In the opinion of the reviewer, this study leans over backwards in minimizing or omitting consideration of the influences of personalities upon the forensic disputation and the debating society. In part this tendency in the study is due to a wise elimination of courses, textbooks, and formal teaching from the main area of research. And the author does point to apparent student pressures for more varied debating. But evidence exists to suggest that Franklin, Witherspoon, Wythe, Johnson, and perhaps many others actively encouraged the forensic disputation in English and helped speed up its wide use in the latter half of the eighteenth century. Later, Dr. Royce's influence at Harvard, apparently in the direction of more carefully written argumentative essays, is rather lengthily presented, yet on page 62 the author states "By 1828 Yale was stressing the importance of 'extemporaneous' as well as written disputes, as was Dartmouth in 1836. . . ." Did Professor Chauncey Goodrich have anything to do with this change at Yale? What, if any, was the influence of Professor Charles Haddock, Webster's nephew, on Dartmouth's forensics? The author has personalized the rise of intercollegiate debating much more fully than the history of either the forensic disputation or the debating society.

As a result of study of college newspapers, catalogs, and brochures on debating, the chapter on intercollegiate debating presents a clear comparison of its origins in the nine colleges. Potter found record of an intersociety debate between teams from Rutgers and New York University in 1881. Is this the earliest instance of a team visiting another campus to debate? Formal "intercollegiate" debating began in these colleges about 1892.

The texts of four examples of speeches delivered in commencement disputations are printed as appendices to the volume.

The study has been carefully prepared for publication with full annotation, a bibliography, and an appropriate foreword by Professor Kopp. On the whole, the work is an important addition to our monographic studies of speech education in America.

GEORGE V. BOHMAN,
Dartmouth College

Practical Voice Practice. By GRANT FAIRBANKS. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1944; pp. vi + 84. $1.00.

Practical Voice Practice is just such a book as the title would lead the casual reader to expect. It is concise but relatively complete. As is the case with any book of its size, each reader will wish that certain sections were more complete. The readers will not agree upon which sections should have been enlarged. The book will prove most helpful to individuals who attempt to improve the use of their voices with no outside assistance from one trained in the field.

The main criticism of the book centers around a consistent inflexibility in the matter of diction and pronunciation. Had the book been written after the publication, in 1944, of *A Pronouncing Dictionary of American English*, by Kenyon and Knott, much of this criticism might have been avoided. This dictionary will have a profound effect upon general attitudes toward pronunciation. Dictionaries "record" but do not "dictate" pronunciation. There are many indications that the author of *Practical Voice Practice* has not fully considered this principle.

Throughout the book there is also a lack of specificity in indicating errors. For example, on page 13, this statement appears: "Omissions of sounds or syllables are common in these words." The list follows but with no indication of the sounds or syllables that are commonly omitted. When the list is examined, the word "diamond" is discovered. This reader assumes that three syllables are implied. The two-syllable pronunciation is commonly heard and is listed as standard by Kenyon and Knott. "Asked" is another word in this list. Although not told what the author had in mind, this reader assumes that it is the "k" sound which is commonly omitted. The fact is that the "k" is so commonly omitted that "ast" is listed by Kenyon and Knott as a standard American pronunciation. These are merely examples.

Most of the practice material is standard

and usable. The reader may wonder why no final sound is given in sentences 1, 5, 16, and 24 on pages 6 and 7; why no medial sound is given in sentences 12 and 15 on the same pages; and why no final sound is given in Exercise 6 on page 31.

On the pronunciation of phrases the text is indefinite and contradictory. In Exercise 2 under Lesson 5 the reader is told, "These phrases, commonly used in everyday speech, are often mispronounced. Substitutions and omissions resulting from carelessness are the most frequent errors. Use reasonable care in speaking such phrases. However, don't be pedantic." A group of 24 phrases follows. The reader is, again, not told what substitutions or omissions are common. Neither is he told what is meant by the use of "reasonable care" in speaking these phrases nor what is meant by "pedantic." One of the phrases is "last night." It is reasonable to suppose that this was included because of the American habit of omitting the "t" in "last." It is commonly done. Not to do it would be "pedantic." Kenyon and Knott give it as a pronunciation "often" heard. Yet on page 8 of *Practical Voice Practice* we read, "A speaker mispronounces a word when he . . . leaves out sounds ('lass' for 'last')." These are, again, but examples. A careful discussion of strong and weak forms would have helped.

The book lacks an earthy approach to standard American English. It is an excellent drill book for the type of voice training that is being done throughout much of the United States.

ARTHUR SECORD, *Brooklyn College*

The Speech Personality. By ELWOOD MURRAY. Revised edition. New York: J. B. Lippincott, 1944; pp. xii + 565. $2.75.

Whether you will like this book or not depends on your philosophy of speech education. If you believe that an orator is a good man speaking well, you still must answer the question: Is it the privilege and/or the duty of the speech teacher to be as much concerned with the creating of "good" men (and women) as it is with teaching men to speak well?

If you agree with Professor Murray, with Professor West in his presidential address last December to the NATS, and with this reviewer, you will accept the challenge that the speech teacher must deal equally with both.

Many are the speech books that attempt to teach people to speak well, but few make a direct and functional attack on the problem of helping develop "good" men and women. Whether you agree with the approach used in *The Speech Personality* or not, you must commend it for its attempt to get at the heart of speech training: the student and his attitudes.

Some have wondered whether the book should be so frank in its dealings with the student. In both Professor Murray's classes, which this reviewer has observed, and in his own classes, less than normal chagrin has been noted. Students have, in fact, welcomed such a direct approach.

The consideration of speech in the student's daily living is very good. Indeed, it would be better if even more emphasis were placed there and less on great public speakers. Too long have we been primarily concerned with speech training for specialized situations in the fundamentals class.

In these days when there is a patriotic appeal to conserve paper, it is regrettable that the publisher did not take this opportunity to put the 126 pages devoted to a case history and 14 blanks to be filled in after various projects into a separate binding. As it stands now, a valuable, well-bound, well-printed book, on good paper, comprising 577 pages, must be discarded after a single semester because 124 pages of blanks have been used.

Those who have used *The Speech Personality* in its earlier edition will find this revision worthy of use again, and those who have not tried this text in their fundamentals classes should give it serious consideration. Without prattling about the hard road to personal improvement, this book sets up projects and exercises which attempt to bring about such growth. *The Speech Personality*, revised, if used correctly, offers excellent opportunities for the integrated growth of both person and speech.

The author says: "The chief developments of concern to the speech personality since this textbook was originally published have come from general semantics. Included in this edition are a supplementary chapter and assignments based on some of the formulations from this field. . . . Other additions include new suggestions for instructors and 10 scenes for extemporaneous dramatization. Professor Cable has done an excellent job of correcting the sections on phonetics.

CLYDE W. DOW,
Massachusetts State College

Encyclopedia of Child Guidance. Edited by RALPH B. WINN. New York: Philosophical Library, 1944; pp. 455. $7.50.

Here is a volume which, in spite of certain short-comings, should appeal to parents and teachers as a handbook of contemporary thought and information on the problem of intelligently bringing up children. From this point of view such listings as those on "Classroom Guidance," "Classroom Teaching," "Education," "Family Guidance," "Family Morale," "Parent-Child Relations," "Learning," "Lying," "Play," "Punishment," "Quarreling," "Radio and Motion Pictures," and the excellent presentation of "Religious Beliefs," are clear, enlightening, and for the most part helpful. Others such as "Binet Test," "Color Blindness," and "Conditioning," are informative, although the first two and a number of other similar expositions are not written in a way that will make easy reading for the layman.

Two subjects in the field of speech are included. James Carrell presents in 7 pages a lucid essay on "Speech Development," covering the topic briefly but adequately for such a volume as this. The presentation is divided into three periods: (a) the prelinguistic, (b) the true linguistic, and (c) the period of vocabulary growth and progressive mastery of complex grammatical forms. The style commends itself to the speech specialist and should be easy reading for parents.

The article on "Speech Disorders" by Augusta Jellinek does justice neither to the author nor to the subject. Not too carefully written or edited, it compresses the material on about a dozen different titles into the space of three pages. The several items touched upon are "Mutism," "Hard of Hearing," "Audimutism," "Aphasia," "Retarded or Delayed Speech," "Dyslalia," "General Dyslalia," "Abnormal Nasalization," "Hyporhinolalia," "Dysarthrias," "Stuttering," and "Vocal Disorders." Four of these, "Hard of Hearing," "Aphasia," "Hyporhinolalia," and "Dysarthrias," are disposed of in fewer than 12 lines, while the exposition of "Retarded or Delayed Speech" is confined to approximately 100 words.

The book has an alphabetical table of contents. It needs a good index. There are the usual cross-references following certain items, but these did not make it possible for the reviewer to locate any comments on speech which did not appear in the two special articles. Combining certain of the items under one general head would have avoided considerable duplication and repetition; for example, in the three articles, "Acceleration," "Gifted Child," and "Superior Child." Careful editing or proofreading would have eliminated such obvious errors as "adopting" for adapting, and "preceding" for preceded.

Incidentally, there is no mention of speech in the article on "Personality," by A. D. Mueller.

H. J. HELTMAN, *Syracuse University*

Say What You Mean. By JOHN B. OPDYCKE. New York: Funk and Wagnalls Company, 1944; pp. xx + 681. $3.75.

Mr. Opdycke has produced a most practical compilation of material on English usage, valuable as a reference work not only for the man in the street but also for intellectual workers.

The book is definitely on language, i, e., use of words. There is a short section on pronunciation, but other aspects of speech are omitted. The outline of chapters indicates the scope of the work: Chapter 1, "Don't Overuse Words"; chapter 2, "Don't Underuse Words"; chapter 3, "Don't Misuse Words"; chapter 4, "Don't Abuse Words"; chapter 5, "Don't Confuse Words"; chapter 6, "Don't Misspell"; chapter 7, "Don't Mispunctuate." Teachers of speech will regret that the treatment of pronunciation is not more complete—that the timely warnings against suppression and omission of syllables, for example, do not include a discussion of the phonetic law of gradation instead of the casual remark that an obscure vowel is more likely to be mispronounced than an accented one. We have little right, however, to criticize the author for not enlarging the scope of his work.

Mr. Opdycke states his purpose as follows: "Expressional trouble begins—and ends—with the difficulties involved in using words exactly and with putting them together with syntactical precision. This implies grammar as corrective. . . . This book is calculated to meet these two difficulties wherever and whenever they present themselves. . . ." Teachers of speech will not agree that problems of expression begin and end with grammar and syntax, but they can agree that the book is an excellent piece of work in the field of language.

In material and method the author is accurate but not technical, sound but not labored. "Corrective treatment of specific error comes first and foremost—live and usable models are placed on the table for dissection. After this is done—only after this is done—corrective rule or principle is set down." More than 2500 faulty everyday expressions are listed and revised. Abundant exercise material is provided in the form of "contests" or competitive games in correcting samples of faulty usage. The last section of each chapter presents some linguistic and historical backgrounds of the practical techniques discussed. An extensive and detailed index, in addition to precise labelling of sections throughout the book, makes it an exceptionally useful reference work.

Mr. Opdycke is to be especially commended for his judicious combination of principle and detail. The logic or, if you prefer, the common sense, of the rules is explained. The author is both a libertarian and an evangel of accuracy and precision in the use of words. He condemns the soft pedagogy which has attempted to push the terminology of grammar and even grammar itself to one side, and reminds us that the illiterate and the vulgarian achieve not liberty, but license. His book is for all who would achieve true liberty under the laws of English usage.

HORACE G. RAHSKOPF,
University of Washington

IN THE PERIODICALS

DORIS G. YOAKAM, *Editor*

RHETORIC, PUBLIC ADDRESS, AND RADIO

ARMBRUSTER, GORDON H., "An Analysis of Ideologies in the Context of Discussion," *The American Journal of Sociology,* L (September, 1944), 123-133.

The analysis of discussions serves as a helpful method in the pursuance of the study of the multiple sources of attitudes and thought processes.

BENDER, JAMES F., "1200 Years of Broadcast Announcing," *Broadcasting* (September 11, 1944), 13.

A review of the requirements of announcing, and the inducements and problems involved.

CONLY, ROBERT, "The Promise of Television," *The American Mercury,* LIX (July, 1944), 58-63.

The radio editor of *Newsweek* presents a discussion on the status of television, and tells of the many technical and financial problems yet to be solved.

ELLIS, RAY C., "Radio in Russia," *Electronic Industries,* III (July, 1944), 76-77, 182, 184, 186, 188, 190.

The scientific aspects of radio in Russia are described. The author believes that the United States and Russia can be of great mutual help to one another in solving postwar radio problems.

FLEMING, D. F., "Radio in a Democracy," *Highroad,* III (July, 1944), 7-9.

The radio listener is far from defenseless. He is free to set up his own criteria for judging the commentators to whom he listens. It is the intelligent citizen's responsibility to exert his influence in raising the standards of radio programs.

FRAKES, MARGARET, "The Use of Radio by the Church," *Highroad,* III (September, 1944), 7-9, 44.

Religious programs vary in quality from the very good to the "simply regrettable." The author of this article offers criticisms of the various programs.

FRAKES, MARGARET, "Trends in Radio," *Highroad,* III (August, 1944), 5-8.

Radio is still in its formative period. If it is to realize its greatest possibilities certain trends now incipient should be fully developed.

HALLOWELL, JOHN H., "Politics and Ethics," *The American Political Science Review,* XXXVIII (August, 1944), 639-655.

The author analyzes the statement commonly made that political scientists should leave ethics to the philosophers and concern themselves primarily with a description and analysis of political behavior.

JOHNSON, ALVIN, "The Issues of the Coming Election," *The Yale Review,* XXXIII (Summer, 1944), 577-585.

The 1944 election should be determined with an eye to the future and not to the past records. The issues are "all American issues." They can not be ordered in the old scheme of Republicans versus Democrats.

LIEBHOLZ, G., "Public Opinion," *The Fortnightly,* No. 932 n. s. (August, 1944), 107-113.

The individual characteristics of public opinion, and the factors of its historical development, furnish the explanation of why so many attacks have been made on it from quite different points of view.

MACDERMOT, H. E., "Goldsmith as a Talker," *Queens' Quarterly,* LI (Summer, 1944), 184-193.

Goldsmith's recorded conversation is anything but poor. He has suffered injustice

as regards his conversational powers because Johnson judged him by standards requiring a seriousness in talk which Goldsmith never possessed.

McKeon, Richard, "Discussion and Resolution in Political Conflicts," *Ethics*, LIV (July, 1944), 235-262.

The manner in which facts, ideals, and concepts are simplified or confused under the influence of favorite modes of expression is one factor in the definition of practical issues, and one problem in the resolution of practical problems.

Matthews, John F., "Your Chance in Radio," *Highroad*, III (August, 1944), 18-20.

The radio business is a strange mixture of fun and futility. Be sure that you know its possibilities and limitations before you decide upon radio as a vocation.

Stott, Roscoe Gilmore, "What Should the Church Render unto Caesar?" *Christian Herald*, LXVII (September, 1944), 21-23.

What is the proper relationship of Church and State? How should the Church deal with politics? The pulpit is more of a "trend maker" than is church journalism. It should be outspoken and positive in upholding the ideals of democracy.

Wright, Basil, "The Film in Propaganda," *The English Speaking World*, XXVI (June-July, 1944), 104-111.

The author discusses the documentary film movement, its purpose and its achievement. The documentary film is designed for the people who have inquisitiveness about things and people, and a leaning towards discussion and argument.

DRAMA AND INTERPRETATION

Dunkel, Wilbur Dwight, "Milton Still Speaks," *Theology Today*, I (July, 1944), 218-233.

In the poetry of Milton can be found answers to many of the questions and many of the doubts men will be asking and thinking as they return from war.

Fallon, Gabriel, "Theatre Cross-Roads," *The Irish Monthly*, LXXII (July, 1944), 286-291.

The Irish theatre suffers from a dearth of plays and from too great an interest in the box office. Suggestions are made for restoring the theatre to health, beauty and creativeness.

Havens, George R., "Voltaire and English Critics of Shakespeare," *The American Society Legion of Honor Magazine*, XV (Summer, 1944), 177-186.

Voltaire frequented the London theatre during his visit to England. This article is concerned with his reactions and attitudes toward Shakespeare.

Herskovits, Melville, "Dramatic Expression Among Primitive Peoples," *The Yale Review*, XXXIII (Summer, 1944), 683-698.

The type of expression we call dramatic can assume innumerable forms. If primitive folk are considered as ordinary folk who merely failed to devise ways of writing, the manifestations of the dramatic urge of primitive societies present revealing characteristics.

Kaplan, Milton A., "Radio and Poetry," *Poetry*, LXIV (August, 1944), 270-279.

Radio verse is enjoying a renaissance that is granting the poet an audience he had almost despaired of ever reaching.

Palmer, Gretta, "Act Your Troubles Away," *Coronet*, XVI (September, 1944), 14-17.

The author explains the purpose and characteristics of the psycho-drama, and tells how it helps both normal and sick people.

Russell, David, "Texas Poetry Week," *The Texas Outlook*, XXVIII (August, 1944), 25-26.

The president of the Texas Poetry Society tells of the plans for the twentieth anniversary of the Texas Poetry Week Celebration, to be held in April, 1945.

Tillett, Nettie S., "Poet of the Present Crisis," *The Sewanee Review*, LII (Summer, 1944), 367-380.

The war world of today has need of such a poet as Wordsworth, for his poetry seems peculiarly fashioned for the present crisis.

Untermeyer, Louis, "So You Think You

Don't Like Poetry," *Good Housekeeping*, CXIX (September, 1944), 24, 97.

"Forget all you have had to 'learn' about poetry," is one of the suggestions of the author of this article. He explains reasons for dislike of poetry and suggests ways of overcoming them.

VEST, WALTER E., "William Shakespeare, Therapeutist," *Southern Medical Journal*, XXXVII (August, 1944), 457-464.

After an analysis of Shakespeare's plays, the author, a physician, comes to the conclusion that Shakespeare "knew and portrayed medicine in the way that he knew and portrayed all nature and all life, as its master."

SPEECH SCIENCE

Anonymous, "Milwaukee's Radio City," *Electronics*, XVII (July, 1944), 94-99.

A description of the physical plant of Milwaukee's Radio City.

Anonymous, "Sound Tricks of the Movies," *Popular Mechanics Magazine*, LXXXII (September, 1944), 56-61.

Sound equipment could produce realistic war scenes, but the result would be a theatre full of shell-shocked spectators. Sound tricks, both for pictures and news-reels, must be planned in terms of audience reception and appreciation.

CARMICHAEL, COLIN, "Vibration and Noise—Causes and Cures," *Machine Design*, XVI (August, 1944), 85-90, 176.

The nature of vibration, sound and noise, the response of the ear to the various frequencies, and the localizing of sources of vibration comprise the contents of this article. It is the first of a series planned to discuss how vibration and noise can be eliminated or at least reduced to satisfactory new low levels.

MOODY, WILLARD, "Theatre Acoustics," *Radio News*, XXXII (August, 1944), 29-31, 126, 128, 130, 144.

The acoustics of a theatre may be determined by the engineering design. The theatre plan and the sound reinforcement equipment must be considered as an entity. And no matter how good the acoustics, the voice of the performer is not going to sound well unless that performer has mastered the technique of talking into microphones.

POCOCK, L. C., "Microphones and Receivers," *Electrical Communication*, XXI, No. 4 (1944), 218-232.

The construction of microphones here is considered with special reference to speech communication.

QUEEN, I., "Microphones," *Radio Craft*, XV (September, 1944), 723-724, 749.

An increase in the home use of microphones is to be expected in the postwar period. It is important, therefore, to study the characteristics of the different types of "mikes" so that the most suitable one can be used.

SONBERGH, GILBERT, "Recording Sound on Film," *Electronic Industries*, III (August, 1944), 98-101, 190, 192, 194, 196.

This article explains factors concerned in the selection and design of equipment for recording and reproducing television motion picture sound.

STANTON, WILLIAM L., "Wire Recording," *Northwestern Engineer*, III (June, 1944), 15-17.

New, improved magnetic wire sound recorders may be as light as six and one-half pounds and as heavy as forty pounds. Continuous recording periods up to seven hours are possible. The wire recorder has several advantages over all other sound recorders. Recording is not affected by vibration and it can easily be erased. Continuity in playing is possible without record changing. Background noises in music recordings are lower.

TURNBULL, WILLIAM W., "Pitch Discrimination as a Function of Tonal Duration," *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, XXXIV (August, 1944), 302-316.

The author reports on experiments aimed to show the relationship between pitch discrimination and stimulus duration.

WASMANSDORFF, CARLTON, "Reducing Radio Noise," *Electronic Industries*, III (July, 1944), 80-83, 170, 172, 176, 178, 180.

This article presents an analysis of various methods which may be used to help eliminate man-made and natural interferences in radio reception.

PHONETICS AND SPEECH USAGE

ALEXANDER, HENRY, "Has Basic a Future?" *Queens' Quarterly,* LI (Summer, 1944), 124-129.

Speedy international travel enhances the need for "debabelization." The author describes the strength and weakness of Basic English in the picture of international communication.

Anonymous, "Science Comes to Languages," *Fortune,* XXX (August, 1944), 133-135, 236, 239-240.

The neighborliness of the world in the postwar period will depend greatly on language. The new methods being used in teaching languages to the armed forces are showing that America knows how to teach and how to learn languages.

BERGMANN, GUSTAV, "Pure Semantics, Sentences, and Propositions," *Mind,* LIII (July, 1944), 238-257.

An exposition on the nature and function of pure semantics as it has been developed in Carnap's recent *Introduction to Semantics* is given and criticized. In conclusion some suggestions are offered about the nature and function of epistemological pragmatics.

BONFANTE, G., and THOMAS, A. SEBEOK, "Linguistics and the Age and Area Hypothesis," *American Anthropologist,* XLVI (July-September, 1944), 382-386.

The general principles of linguistic geography should be of aid to the ethnologist and to the social anthropologist in their own fields of study.

GOGARTY, OLIVER ST. JOHN, "The Wonder of Words," *Tomorrow,* IV (September, 1944), 45-49.

Words are the "messengers that bind the human race together." Words have dignity, charm, and importance. They are the symbols that transmit thought.

MACLEISH, ARCHIBALD, "The Word and the Fact," *The Atlantic Monthly,* CLXXIV (July, 1944), 52-55.

Only the people can give life to language. The great abstractions used throughout American history must be reinterpreted if they are to maintain potency of meaning. The author believes that "if even now, even at this late last moment, the great abstractions of democracy can take their honest meanings and have their truthful way, more than a war will have been fought and won."

MILES, JOSEPHINE, "The Sweet and Lovely Language," *The Kenyon Review,* VI (Summer, 1944), 355-368.

The author describes the word usage of Gerard Manley Hopkins, a champion and great master of epithet, and a "word painting poet."

NURNBERG, MAXWELL, "How We Got Our Family Names," *Good Housekeeping,* CXIX (September, 1944), 37, 74-75.

The names of places, colors and animals played an important part in England in the eleventh and twelfth centuries when family names began to be adopted for purpose of identification.

PARK, JOE, "An Analysis of the Verbal Accompaniment to Classroom Sound Films," *The School Review,* LII (September, 1944), 420-426.

A study of the verbal accompaniment to educational films reveals that the majority of words used are below the 6,000 word level of the Thorndike list, and do not take into account grade placement. The average sentence length is long when compared with themes written by students, but is average when compared with selected textbooks.

TINKER, EDWARD LAROCQUE, "Will Babel Be Beaten?" *The American Scholar,* XIII (Summer, 1944), 322-328.

If an international auxiliary language is ever adopted it will be of great assistance to the world of tomorrow. Many dangers of misunderstanding lurk in language use. A means of facile international communication is important.

YU-SHAN HAN, "Chinese Proverbs: A Demo-

cratic Heritage," *The China Monthly*, V (July-August, 1944), 22-24.

Chinese proverbs have almost become a language in themselves. Anyone who wishes to understand China should study her proverbs.

PSYCHOLOGY AND PATHOLOGY OF SPEECH

ARIEFF, ALEX J., and LEO A. KAPLAN, "Cerebellar Type of Ataxia Associated with Cerebral Signs," *The Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease*, C (August, 1944), 135-141.

The authors report on five cases in which diseases not familial or hereditary produced a cumulation of signs and symptoms of cerebellar ataxia, dysarthria, intention tremor, involvement of the pyramidal tracts and at times dementia and convulsions.

BARSKY, ARTHUR J., "Psychology of the Patient Undergoing Plastic Surgery," *The American Journal of Surgery*, LXV August, 1944), 238-243.

In the many articles appearing recently on plastic surgery little has been said on the psychological factors involved. These are important and must be taken into consideration by the surgeon if he is to be of real aid to patients seeking plastic surgery.

BENDER, JAMES F., "Do You Know Someone Who Stutters?" *The Scientific Monthly*, LIX (September, 1944), 221-225.

The characteristics and causes of stuttering are reviewed. Cases are presented in the discussion of therapy. The author advises the stutterer to consult a speech correctionist, and concludes that the problem of stuttering can be alleviated "if only the stutterer will give himself the opportunity, and progressive communities will make that opportunity possible."

CAMPBELL, PAUL A., "Aerosinusitis—Its Cause, Course, and Treatment," *The Annals of Otology, Rhinology and Laryngology*, LIII (June, 1944), 291-301.

The entity of aerosinusitis is discussed in this article, and a report on five cases is presented.

CHESS, STELLA, "Developmental Language Disability As A Factor in Personality Distortion in Childhood," *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, XIV (July, 1944), 483-490.

The author believes that language disabilities should be looked upon as a clinical entity of primary nature, and that this should be considered in the differential diagnosis of childhood disorders and neurotic and psychotic states. Seven selected cases of children with behavior problems, who were also found to have language disability and personality distortions, are discussed.

COAKLEY, WALTER A., and JOSEPH M. BAKER, "Fractures of the Jaw," *The American Journal of Surgery*, LXV (August, 1944), 244-247.

An analysis of the causes, involvements, treatment, and sequelae of fractures of the jaw is presented from a study of 212 cases ranging in age from three and one-half to seventy-four years.

COLLINS, E. G., "Injury to the Ears Among Battle Casualties of the Western Desert," *The Journal of Laryngology and Otology*, LIX (January, 1944), 1-15.

The author was impressed with the number of patients complaining of deafness or of discharging ears at the end of the first battle of Libya. So he studied the casualties arriving at a base hospital from the second battle of Libya and in this article presents his findings.

DAVIDOFF, EUGENE, GEORGE M. DOOLITTLE, and VINCENT I. BONAFEDE, "Psychiatric Aspects of Epilepsy," *The Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease*, C (August, 1944), 170-184.

Chronic epilepsy is a disorder of the total personality. Defective personality integration "appears to take precedence over purely anatomical and circumscribed physiological factors in influencing the development of chronic epileptic psychoses and deterioration."

DAVIDSON, G. M., "The Final Common Path of the Total Personality," *The Psychiatric Quarterly*, XVIII (July, 1944), 459-476.

The purpose of the author is to outline a program for a uniform study of psychiatric disorders, and to attempt to create a basis

upon which all workers in psychiatry can build in harmony, each from his own angle.

DEUTSCH, FELIX, "Civilian War Neuroses and their Treatment," *The Psychoanalytic Quarterly*, XIII (July, 1944), 300-312.

Civilian war neuroses appear to be family neuroses par excellence.

EVERTS, WILLIAM H., and BARNES WOODHALL, "The Management of Head and Spinal Cord Injuries in the Army," *The Journal of the American Medical Association*, CXXVI (September 16, 1944), 145-148.

The number and types of head and spinal cord injuries are stated, and the procedure followed in treating patients is outlined.

FELDMAN, FRED, and D. EWEN CAMERON, "Speech in Senility," *The American Journal of Psychiatry*, CI (July, 1944), 64-67.

When the speech of twenty-eight psychotic senile patients was analyzed grammatically and was compared with that of seventeen normal adults and children it was found that the most prominent differences were in the use of pronouns, nouns, verbs, and adjectives.

GAUSS, HARRY, "The Neurotic Patient. A Discussion of the Causes and Treatment of Neurosis," *The American Journal of Digestive Diseases*, XI (August, 1944), 248-251.

The symptoms and involvements of neurosis are delineated. Recommendations are given concerning diagnosis and therapy.

GELLHORN, ERNST, "The Effect of Muscle Pain on the Central Nervous System at the Spinal and Cortical Levels," *The Journal Lancet*, LXIV (July, 1944), 242-245.

The author reports upon investigations to determine the influence of experimentally created muscle pain on muscular coordination. He states the belief that "afferent impulses, particularly those originating in the muscle have a profound influence on the reflex activities of the spinal cord as well as on cortically induced movements."

GRANT, WILLIAM T., "The Clinical Diagnosis of Cerebellar Injuries," *California and Western Medicine*, LX (April, 1944), 204-209.

When a part of the cerebellum is destroyed, the remainder is capable of early re-education. This is possible because of the diffuse and multiple arrangement of the connections of the cerebellum. Although the tendency is to recover rapidly, disturbing symptoms may remain. Good examination is necessary.

HILLMAN, CHARLES C., "The Army Rehabilitation Program for the Blind and the Deafened," *Archives of Physical Therapy*, XXV (August, 1944), 478-481, 506.

This article explains the army rehabilitation program for the blind and deafened and mentions the instructional facilities for training in residual hearing, lip reading and proper speech control.

HARROWER-ERICKSON, M. R., "The Rorschach Test," *Journal of the Association of American Medical Colleges*, XIX (July, 1944), 193-201.

Who was Rorschach and what is this personality test that bears his name? The author of this article attempts to answer this and other questions concerning the Rorschach test.

HOWES, W. E., and M. PLATAU, "Carcinoma of the Larynx," *Archives of Otolaryngology*, XL (August, 1944), 133-138.

The most significant prognostic factor in laryngeal cancer is the exact site of the origin of the lesion. This will largely determine the rapidity of the growth and the effectiveness of therapeutical procedures.

JUDGE, ARNOLD F., "An Unusual Foreign Body of the Larynx," *Archives of Otolaryngology*, XL (July, 1944), 60.

Loss of voice and other symptoms are discussed in this case report of a soldier who had a penetrating missle lodged in his throat.

LAURENCE, EDWIN A., and ASHLEY W. OUGHTERSON, "Carcinoma of the Lip at the New Haven Hospital, 1921 to 1940, Inclusive," *The Connecticut State Medical Journal*, VIII (June, 1944), 353-357.

Case reports on 113 patients with cancer of the lip are reviewed.

LEVINSON, ABRAHAM, "Neonatal Neurologic Disturbances," *Quarterly Journal of Northwestern Medical School,* XVIII (Summer Quarter, 1944), 91-103.

An attempt is made in this study to group the symptoms of neonatal neurologic disturbances, and to correlate them with other pathological conditions.

LICHT, SIDNEY, "The Other Hand," *Occupational Therapy and Rehabilitation,* XXIII (June, 1944), 119-120.

An analysis of the strains encountered in the work done by the nondominant hand is essential to an understanding of involvements which may otherwise be considered hysterical in nature.

MACKENZIE, CHARLES M., "Facial Deformity and Change in Personality Following Corrective Surgery," *Northwest Medicine,* XLIII (August, 1944), 230-231.

Patients with facial deformities usually exhibit, the so-called "shut-in" personality. Corrective surgery may result in remarkable changes of personality.

MCKIBBEN, STELLA, "The Situation Versus the Condition—Congenital Spastic Paraplegia," *Bulletin of the Menninger Clinic,* VIII (May, 1944), 83-88.

A spastic paralytic presents a discussion on the subject from the personal approach.

MORGAN, SARAH S., and JOHN J. B. MORGAN, "An Examination of the Development of Certain Adaptive Behavior Patterns in Infants," *The Journal of Pediatrics,* XXV (August, 1944), 168-177.

A study was made at The Cradle, Evanston, Illinois, of eighteen infants during the first ninety days of life. This report tells of the development of certain reactions and abilities.

NEW, GORDON B., and EDWARD L. FOSS, "Tumors of the Nose and the Throat," *Archives of Otolaryngology,* XL (August, 1944), 142-149.

The authors describe symptoms and therapy of tumors that appear in the areas of the esophagus, trachea, oropharynx, hypopharynx, larynx, lips, mouth, nose, and accessory sinuses.

NORTHINGTON, PAGE, "Otolaryngologic Problems of Aviation," *New York State Journal of Medicine,* XLIV (August 1, 1944), 1655-1660.

This article has to do with such medical problems as those connected with aerial equilibration, and alterations caused by altitude, by ascent and by descent.

PAPEZ, JAMES W., 'Structures and Mechanisms Underlying the Cerebral Functions," *The American Journal of Psychology,* LVII (July, 1944), 291-316.

A realistic structural basis for many of the more highly integrated functions of the brain is suggested.

POLLOCK, LEWIS J., JAMES G. GOLSETH and ALEX J. ARIEFF, "The Use of Discontinuity of Strength During Curves in Muscle in Diagnosis of Peripheral Nerve Lesions," *Surgery, Gynecology and Obstetrics,* LXXIX (August, 1944), 133-141.

Electrodiagnosis is demonstrated to be useful in diagnosing processes of nervous degeneration and regeneration.

RIESE, W., "The Principle of Compensation of Nervous Function," *The Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease,* C (September, 1944), 263-274.

Definition and description of the principle of compensation and pseudo-compensation are presented.

ROBINSON, J. MATHEWS, "Lymphangitis of the Mucosa of the Paranasal Sinuses," *Texas State Journal of Medicine,* XL (July, 1944), 193-199.

This disorder of the lymph spaces may include affections of the nose and ears.

ROTHSTEIN, EMIL, and H. B. PIRKLE, "Tracheotomy for Tuberculous Laryngeal Stenosis," *The American Review of Tuberculosis,* L (August, 1944), 176-178.

Laryngeal stenosis may result from the formation of dense scar tissue in the process of healing of tuberculous lesions of the larynx. Tuberculosis of the larynx is frequent as a complication of pulmonary tuberculosis.

STERNSTEIN, H. J., and J. B. MCGREGOR, "The Effect of Nasal Ventilation Upon Tubal

Equalizing Efficiency in Flying Personnel," *The Journal of Aviation Medicine,* XV (August, 1944), 244-257.

Nasal resistance of low magnitude in the non-obstructed nose produces a relatively high index of tubal equalizing efficiency with little or no susceptibility to aero-otitis media in the low pressure chamber.

STROMMEN, EINAR, "Statistical Trends Among Hearing Aid Users," *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America,* XV (April, 1944), 211-222.

The results of a study of 10,000 case records of hearing aid users are presented.

TAYLOR, H. MARSHALL, "Traumatic Deafness; Problems of Prevention," *The Laryngoscope,* LIV (July, 1944), 362-373.

Adequate acoustic insulation would be of great aid in alleviating traumatic deafness.

WALDROP, GLADYS R., "Physical Therapy Defined," *The Journal of Health and Physical Education,* XV (June, 1944), 321, 351-353.

The author outlines the characteristics and qualifications of a good physical therapist.

WALKER, CHARLES C., "The Hard of Hearing and Hearing Aids," *The Journal of the Iowa State Medical Society,* XXXIV (July, 1944), 274-276.

Otologists should assume an active part in giving scientific advice to hard of hearing patients on the value and use of hearing aids.

WEISER, H. I., "Treatment of Bronchial Asthma by Intensive Breathing Therapy," *Archives of Physical Therapy,* XXV (August, 1944), 461-468.

Asthmatic patients may alleviate dyspnea by learning how to control the breathing process.

WILLIAMS, HENRY L., "Intrinsic Allergy as it Affects the Ear, Nose and Throat: The Intrinsic Allergy Syndrome," *Transactions American Academy of Ophthalmology and Otolaryngology,* (July-August, 1944), 379-412.

Allergy rather than infection may be the cause of many head pains associated with nasal and aural disease.

ZEITER, WALTER J., "Practical Application of Physical Therapy in Medicine," *Southern Medical Journal,* XXXVIII (July, 1944), 378-382.

Physical therapy in rehabilitation is assuming increasing importance. Many simple types of treatment can be prescribed in addition to those carried out in the hospital.

SPEECH PEDAGOGY

ARMFELT, R. M., "Britain Teaches by Radio," *The Nation's Schools,* XXXIV (August, 1944), 47-48.

This article tells of the work done by the British Broadcasting Company since 1923 in presenting school programs.

BADENOCH, NENA W., "Lifting a Handicap," *Hygeia,* XXII (July, 1944), 498-499, 559.

Much can be done to aid the handicapped by teaching them skill in the crafts.

BOOME, E. J., "The Scope of Speech Therapy," *British Medical Bulletin,* II, No. 6 (1944), 121-122.

The author sheds light upon the speech reeducation program of Great Britain.

CLAPP, JOHN MANTLE, "Better Writing Through Better Talking," *The New York Certified Public Accountant,* XIV (August, 1944), 521-529.

Suggestions are made to accountants for improving the communicative skills.

COUTTS, ALAN, "Speaking of Speech," *Ladies Home Journal,* LXI (August, 1944), 5.

Parents are advised in this article concerning procedures to follow in aiding children with speech difficulties.

D'AMICO, VICTOR E., "Theatre As A Teaching Tool," *Theatre Arts,* XXVIII (July, 1944), 406-409.

The realization of the major objectives of today's education is to be found in well-planned school dramatics.

EGINTON, DANIEL P., "Checking List for Analyzing the Voice," *The Texas Outlook,* XXVIII (July, 1944), 47.

Discussion is given on the importance of a good voice and on methods of voice improvement. A check list is offered to help the individual evaluate his needs and his progress.

ELDRIDGE, RAYMON, "Marionettes," *The National Elementary Principal,* XXIII (July, 1944), 65-69.

The principal of the Lawrence School, Brookline, Massachusetts, evaluates a 10-year program of marionette shows.

FOX, LILLIAN MOHR, "Rhythmic Self-Expression by Third-Grade Pupils," *The National Elementary Principal,* XXIII (July, 1944), 79-85.

Children of the third-grade level were given an opportunity every day to engage in creative rhythms, including expression of original ideas through body movement. A report on their creations over a half-year period is given.

FRANK, CAROL, "Occupational Therapy for Children with Cerebral Palsy," *Occupational Therapy and Rehabilitation,* XXIII (June, 1944), 103-114.

Occupational therapy can be of much help if planned to fit the special needs of children with cerebral palsy.

GOLDSTEIN, KURT, "Special Institutions and Rehabilitation of Soldiers with Brain Injuries," *Occupational Therapy and Rehabilitation,* XXIII (June, 1944), 115-118.

The author outlines essential features of the procedures used in the last war in the rehabilitation of soldiers afflicted with brain injuries, and gives advice on training to follow this war.

HANSEN, RUTH, "Coddling or Training for the Cerebral Palsied?" *The Training School Bulletin,* XLI (June, 1944), 61-68.

Case histories of two children "suffering from coddling" form the basis of this discussion on the evils of coddling the weak or handicapped.

HARRIS, FRED E., "What Emphasis Should Be Placed on Emotions?" *The Elementary School Journal,* XLIV (June, 1944), 590-593.

Teachers should recognize, analyze, and treat individual emotional problems. Emotional unity is a motivating factor in education.

HENRICKSON, FLOYD E., "Radio and the Education Program of the Future," *The School Executive,* LXIV (September, 1944), 66-67.

Equipment "musts" are included in this analysis of the potential uses of the radio in the schools.

HUBBARD, RUTH M., "The Psychologist Working with Crippled Children," *Mental Hygiene,* XXVIII (July, 1944), 397-407.

The author depicts the part the psychologist plays in the formulation of plans for satisfactory living for the crippled child.

JENNINGS, GEORGE, *et al.*, "Radio Programs Lead to Creative Activities," *The National Elementary Principal,* XXIII (July, 1944), 91-98.

The acting director of the Radio Council of the Chicago Public Schools tells how radio contributes to creative activities in the classroom.

KNAPP, ROBERT H., "Are We Overlooking Personality?" *The Nation's Schools,* XXXIV (September, 1944), 26-27.

The nation's need and the school's responsibility for developing well-integrated personalities has been shown to be paramount by the present war, a result of power in the hands of maladjusted men.

MCGEHEE, FRANCES, "An Experimental Study of Voice Recognition," *The Journal of General Psychology,* XXXI (July, 1944), 53-65.

Audience reaction to recorded voices serves as the basis of the study reported upon in this article.

MASLOW, A. H., "What Intelligence Tests Mean," *The Journal of General Psychology,* XXXI (July, 1944), 85-93.

Intelligence tests tell only what *is* the case. They do not reveal how this situation came to pass, nor why.

MORRIS, EMMETT, "Interclassroom Radio

Broadcasts," *The National Elementary Principal,* XXIII (July, 1944), 150-151.

The principal of the Irving School, Maywood, Illinois, tells of the effectiveness of using the public address system as a medium for practice in putting on school "radio" programs.

PATTIE, FRANK A., and BILLIE BRANDT KNIGHT, "Why Does the Speech of Stutterers Improve in Chorus Reading?" *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology,* XXXIX (July, 1944), 362-367.

An experiment in having the stutterer read before a small audience in unison with a voice heard by him over the telephone is reported upon in this article. Twelve subjects were used in different situations.

ROSENZWEIG, SAUL, *et al.,* "An Elementary Syllabus of Psychological Tests," *The Journal of Psychology,* XVIII (July, 1944), 9-40.

The purpose of this article is to explain the purpose, materials, instructions, scoring methods and interpretation of a representative group of psychological tests.

SHAFTO, MARY, "Pupil-Planned Assemblies," *The National Elementary Principal,* XXIII (July, 1944), 183-186.

The machinery for program planning, the nature of the programs presented, and the creative opportunities offered in assembly programs planned by students are explained in this article written by a teacher of Bradley Park School, Neptune, New Jersey.

SMITH, ALLAN A., "College Teachers Evaluated by Students," *Sociology and Social Research,* XXVIII (July-August, 1944), 471-478.

The purpose of the study reported upon is to obtain new light on what students consider to be good teaching under present social conditions.

TRUEX, EDWARD H., JR., "The Rehabilitation Service for the Hard of Hearing at Deshon General Hospital, Butler, Pennsylvania," *The Journal of the Acoustical Society of America,* XVI (July, 1944), 71-74.

The acting Chief of Service at Deshon Hospital tells of the work being done there for and with the hard-of-hearing.

TSCHECHTELIN, S. M. AMATORA, "A 22-Trait Personality Rating Scale," *The Journal of Psychology,* XVIII (July, 1944), 3-8.

The author presents a personality rating scale to be used by children of grades four through eight.

VILLARREAL, JESSE J., "Short Cuts in Teaching English as a Second Language," *The Texas Outlook,* XXVIII (July, 1944), 11-13.

The speech laboratory serves as an adjunct of the language program at the University of Texas.

NEWS AND NOTES

RUTH P. KENTZLER, *Editor*

(Hereafter please send items of interest for this department to the incoming Editor of News and Notes: OTA THOMAS, HUNTER COLLEGE, NEW YORK CITY.)

Miami University has begun a daily radio broadcast, Mondays through Fridays, over Station WMOH of Hamilton, Ohio. Mondays will be devoted to "service programs," and will cover subjects such as Income Tax Advice and Selecting Children's Books, on which the University can render a particular service to citizens in its area of the state. Tuesdays will be devoted to music under the title, "Music You Should Know." Wednesdays will introduce information drawn from the broad fields of the natural sciences. Thursdays will be given to the liberal arts through the "Curious Student" programs. Fridays will end the weekly broadcasts with a summary and comment on the week's news.

Harry M. Williams, Head of the Department of Speech, is Chairman of the University Radio Committee, which is in charge of the programs. Hortense Moore, Assistant Professor of Speech, is the University Studio Manager.

• • •

Mrs. Marie Bergin Kraft, formerly with the Extension Department of Brown University, is now a member of the Department of Speech in Miami University.

• • •

Walter B. Emery, on leave from Ohio State University, has recently been appointed Editor of *Personnel Administration*, the official magazine of the Society for Personnel Administration in Washington, D.C. The magazine goes to about 700 governmental officials in Washington in addition to having coverage in the educational field throughout the country. Professor Emery is with the Federal Communications Commission in Washington, and recently has been promoted to Special Assistant to Commissioner Paul A. Walker.

• • •

Mrs. Inez Norman Brilty, a former assistant in the Department of Speech of Ohio State University, has entered Columbia University to undertake further graduate work in speech.

• • •

Mrs. Dorothy Siedenberg Hadley of Portsmouth, Ohio, is now Assistant in the Department of Speech in Ohio State University.

• • •

Mrs. Sarah Huntsman Sturgess, Assistant Professor of Dramatic Art in the University of California at Berkeley, retired last July 1. She had been with the University for over 20 years.

Annie H. Allen, Associate in the Department of Public Speaking at the University of California at Berkeley, and an occasional contributor to the JOURNAL, retired September 1, after 38 years of service with the University.

• • •

Barnard Hewitt has returned to his duties as Assistant Professor in Brooklyn College after serving 14 months as Managing Editor of the *Evening News of the Tonawandas*, North Tonawanda, New York.

• • •

Other news items from the Department of Speech in Brookyln College are as follows:

On leave of absence: Margaret M. McCarthy and Louise J. Rietz.

Returned from leave: Marvin G. Bauer, Mrs. Catherine N. Myers, and Mrs. Loretta A. W. Smith.

Loretta A. Wagner is now Mrs. Smith.

Mrs. Mary Cardozo is now at the Children's Memorial Hospital, Montreal, Quebec.

Mrs. Hinze is at the State University of Iowa.

New additions: Mrs. Hilda W. Silverman and Flora Schreiber.

• • •

Sara Stinchfield Hawk, Associate Editor of the JOURNAL, has recently been appointed visiting Associate Professor of Psychology in Scripps College, Claremont, California. She

is teaching mental testing and elementary psychology, and is training upperclass girls in speech correction for the nursery school and local work in the vicinity.

• • •

Wilbur E. Gilman, now on leave from the University of Missouri, is spending the year on the staff of Queens College. Last summer Professor Gilman taught in Brooklyn College.

• • •

James A. Winans, Professor Emeritus of Dartmouth College since 1942, has been appointed to serve in Wilbur E. Gilman's place at the University of Missouri during the latter's leave of absence.

• • •

Katherine King, who was a member of the faculty at William Woods College last year, has now joined the staff of the University of Missouri. Miss King took her master's degree in the University of Missouri in 1943.

• • •

Frederick H. Koch, Kenan Professor of Dramatic Literature in the University of North Carolina, died on August 16, shortly before reaching his sixty-seventh birthday. A graduate of Ohio Wesleyan in 1900 and of George Pierce Baker's 47 Workshop in 1909, Professor Koch was one of the pioneers in American educational theatre and especially, in his later life, of folk plays. From 1905 to 1918 he was on the faculty of the University of North Dakota, and there founded the Dakota Playmakers. On going to the University of North Carolina in 1918, he at once founded the Carolina Playmakers. He was the originator of rural community drama by cooperative authorship, founder of the native folk-playing movement in North Carolina, editor of nine volumes of folk plays, and author of five volumes on community drama.

His activities were not confined to the two states in which he lived during the last thirty-nine years of his life. Almost continuously from 1920 until 1941 he served as visiting professor on the summer school faculties of other institutions: California, Southern California, Colorado, Columbia, New York University, Northwestern, and Alberta. At various times he had also served as honorary president of the Canadian Playmakers, as associate editor of the *Little Theatre Monthly*, and as dramatic editor of the *Southern Literary Messenger*.

The Reading Clinic Staff of the School of Education, The Pennsylvania State College, State College, Pennsylvania, is sponsoring two important meetings on reading problems during 1945:

The Annual Seminar on Reading Disabilities will be held from January 29 to February 2, 1945. Demonstrations and discussions on a differentiated program for analyzing and typing, or classifying, reading disabilities will be conducted by the Staff of the Reading Analysis Unit of the Reading Clinic. Remedial techniques will be demonstrated and discussed by the staff of the Reading Clinic Laboratory School. A number of visiting speakers and demonstrators have been included. The program has been planned to interest remedial teachers, school psychologists, speech teachers, neurologists, otologists, and vision specialists.

From June 26 to June 29, 1945, the Reading Clinic Staff will conduct the Annual Conference on Reading Instruction. This Conference deals with classroom problems. The activities are differentiated for elementary and secondary teachers, college teachers, special class teachers, speech teachers, and school psychologists.

• • •

Rosetta V. Ramsey, formerly of the Monroe, Michigan, High School and of Alma College, is now on the faculty of the University of Hawaii. Her schedule includes work in the speech laboratory, and classes in freshman composition and in adult education.

• • •

George J. Peavey, who was last year on the faculty of Stanford University, is now supervising the teaching of speech and English for the Department of Public Instruction of the Territory of Hawaii.

• • •

William C. Craig, after serving thirteen years as Chairman of the Department of Speech in Capital University, returned this fall to his alma mater, the College of Wooster, as professor of speech. He succeeds Emerson W. Miller who died in October of 1943. His courses at Wooster include Fundamentals of Public Speaking, Radio, Speech Correction, Play Directing, Acting, and Play Production. Professor Craig is President this year of the Ohio Association of College Teachers of Speech. His book on *The Preacher's Voice*, written in collaboration

with R. R. Sokolowski of Capital University, has just appeared from the press.

* * *

Robert T. Oliver, recently on leave from Bucknell University as Senior Administrative Officer in the War Food Administration, Washington, D.C., is now Associate Professor of Speech in Syracuse University in charge of rhetoric and public speaking.

* * *

Allwin Monson, who last year taught geography in the Army course, has returned to his position as instructor of speech in Syracuse University.

* * *

Wynett Barnett, who was in Brooklyn College last year, is Assistant Professor of Speech in Syracuse University. She is in charge of instruction in the speech arts, and replaces Editha A. Parsons, who is now on leave of absence, to be followed by retirement.

* * *

Janet Bolton is an instructor in individual instruction and speech correction in Syracuse University.

* * *

Claude Kantner has resigned from Louisiana State University to become speech correctionist in the Crippled Children's Division of State Department of Oregon. His headquarters are in Portland.

* * *

Jeanette O. Anderson, formerly of Purdue University, replaces Professor Kantner at Louisiana State. She is Director of the Speech Clinic and Associate Professor of Speech.

* * *

Adeline McClelland of the Dearborn, Michigan, public schools succeeds Jeanette O. Anderson at Purdue. Miss McClelland is a graduate of Slippery Rock (Pa.) State Teachers College, has a Master's degree from Pennsylvania State College, and is taking further graduate work in the University of Michigan.

* * *

Ernest H. Reed, on leave of absence from Indiana State Teachers College, is now a lieutenant colonel in the Army. He is in general charge of academic training for soldiers under the command of the Adjutant General's School.

* * *

Howard C. Hansen, formerly instructor in Kent State University, Ohio, is now Assistant Professor of Speech in MacMurray College.

* * *

A. C. LaFollette and Charles B. Watts are new members of the speech staff in Ohio University, the former coming from Murray State Teachers College, Kentucky, and the latter from work with the USO.

* * *

Sidney Stone, formerly of Iowa State College, is now Director of Radio in Bowling Green State University, Ohio. He will teach beginning speech and radio courses, and direct the university broadcasting schedule over station WFIN.

Lieutenant Upton Palmer, on leave from Bowling Green, has been made Director of Orientation for the Santa Ana Air Base in California.

* * *

R. R. Sokolowsky, Speech Pathologist in Capital University, Ohio, died of cerebral hemorrhage on June 25. Formerly a practicing physician in the city of Königsberg and Professor Extraordinarius in the University of Königsberg, he left that University in 1934, came to this country, and joined the faculty of Capital University in 1940. He was known throughout Germany as one of its eminent authorities on speech correction, and was author of more than thirty articles in American and European journals. His latest publication was a book on *The Preacher's Voice*, of which he was co-author with William C. Craig.

* * *

Lieutenant Eugene F. Hahn, USNR, on leave from Wayne University, died of pneumonia at Newport, Rhode Island, on October 29. Lieutenant Hahn received his Ph.D. in 1941 from the University of Southern California, and was Associate Professor in Wayne. He was author of an outstanding book on therapy for stutterers, and had been contributor to various professional magazines including the JOURNAL. In the Navy he was lecturer in its War College at Newport. Earnest and diligent as a teacher, exact and original in research, his untimely death is a loss to the profession.

* * *

After being out of the field of speech for two and a half years, Kathryn Howard Makeig is now teaching in George Washington University. From May, 1942, until March, 1943, she was a USO Director in San Francisco. She then resigned to be married to a naval officer and for the next six months travelled across

country with him. After he was sent to sea duty again, Mrs. Makeig, on October 18, became an instructor of speech in George Washington University. Her work there includes courses in voice and diction, public speaking, and foreign dialect. She will also take over responsibility for the speech clinic, formerly handled by Verna Finger Torgerson before the latter's resignation.

• • •

Carroll P. Lahman is on leave during 1944-1945 from Albion College, and is living at 1228 Center Street, Redlands, California. The purpose of his leave is to take his wife into a warmer and drier climate because of her arthritis.

During Professor Lahman's absence, Miss Beulah Champ is acting as Chairman of the Department; and Harry B. Gough, Past President of the Association and Emeritus Professor from DePauw, is taking over Professor Lahman's classes and extracurricular work.

Ruth P. Kentzler, an Associate Editor of the JOURNAL and formerly a Director of the USO at Madison, Wisconsin, is now a USO Director in Lihue, Kauai, Hawaii. She took up her duties there on September 23. Kauai is the northernmost island in the Hawaiian group.

• • •

At Ohio University, Athens, Charles B. Watts, formerly of Oregon State University, has filled the place in dramatics and theatre management previously occupied by Joseph D. Batcheller. Professor Batcheller is now teaching at the University of New Hampshire. A. C. LaFollette, who formerly taught at Murray State College, Murray, Kentucky, replaced Lyman M. Partridge in speech pathology. Professor Partridge is now located at the Washington Central College of Education in Ellensburg, Washington. Earl C. Seigfred, Dean of the College of Fine Arts, is again acting head of the School of Dramatic Art and Speech in the continued absence of Robert Gates Dawes, who is in the service.

AMONG THE CONTRIBUTORS

LIONEL CROCKER, *Editor*

Karl R. Wallace: *A Glance Ahead at the Field of Speech* (A.B., M.A., Ph.D., Cornell), is Chairman of the School of Public Speaking in the University of Virginia and Editor-elect of the JOURNAL for the term, 1945-1948. He was a member of the Editorial Committee that recently brought out *Studies in Speech and Drama in Honor of A. M. Drummond*, and is author of *Francis Bacon on Communication and Rhetoric*.

Lt. Argus J. Tresidder: *Speech in the Military Program* (A.B., M.A., Ph.D., Cornell), now Educational Officer in the Navy V-12 Unit of the University of Louisville, is in civilian life Professor of English in Madison College, Virginia. He is the author of *Reading to Others*, co-author with Charles Jones and Leland Schubert of *Writing and Speaking*, author of the chapter on diction in Sandford and Yeager, *Principles of Effective Speaking*, and is a contributor to *Studies in Speech and Drama in Honor of Alexander M. Drummond*.

Lou LaBrant: *Speech For Americans* (Ph.D., Northwestern) is Professor of English Education, New York University, and is author of many articles and monographs on the teaching of English, language growth and the relation of language to other aspects of the curriculum, and of several books and chapters on these topics. Formerly a member of the Ohio State University faculty, with assignment in the laboratory school, Professor LaBrant has also taught summers at Northwestern, Mills College, University of Arkansas, University of Kansas, University of Texas, Harvard University, and Tulane University.

Paul A. Walker: *Postwar Communications and Speech Education* (Ph.B., Chicago; LL.B., Oklahoma) is a member of the Federal Communications Commission, now serving his 2nd term. He taught speech for 3 years in the University of Oklahoma, served as Chairman of the Oklahoma Corporation Commission, and was appointed a member of the Federal Communications Commission in 1934.

Walter B. Emery: *Postwar Communications and Speech Education* (A.B. Oklahoma Baptist University; LL.B., Oklahoma; Ph.D. Wisconsin) is on leave from Ohio State University and is now serving as Special Assistant to Commissioner in the Federal Communications Commission. He was recently appointed Editor of *Personnel Administration*, official journal of the Society for Personnel Administration in Washington. He was also recently admitted to practice before the Supreme Court of the United States.

C. M. Wise: *The Language Problem of German-Speaking Refugees . . .* (A.B., Northeast Missouri State Teachers College; M.A., Chicago; Ph.D. Wisconsin), Head of the Department of Speech in Louisiana State University, is the author of *Dramatics for School and Community; A Book of Dramatic Costume* (with Edith Dabney); *Bases of Speech* (with G. W. Gray); *Foundations of Speech* (with J. M. O'Neill, Editor, *et al.*); and numerous plays and articles.

Morris Cohen: *The Language Problems of German-Speaking Refugees . . .* has done graduate and special work at Columbia University, Northwestern University, and the University of Southern California. Mr. Cohen has his own studio in Hollywood which he hopes will become a school of speech.

Loren D. Reid: *The Perils of Rhetorical Criticism* (A.B., Grinnell; M.A., Ph.D., Iowa) is Professor of Speech in the University of Missouri, a member of the Executive Council of the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS OF SPEECH, an Associate Editor of the QUARTERLY JOURNAL OF SPEECH, and past president of the New York State Speech Association. He has contributed several articles and reviews to this JOURNAL. His latest article, "Private John Allen: A Humorist in Politics," was reprinted in the *Journal of the Mississippi Historical Society*.

Wayne C. Eubank: *Benjamin Morgan Palmer, Southern Divine* (B.S., West Texas State College; M.A., Northwestern; Ph.D. Louisiana) wrote his Ph.D. dissertation on the subject of this paper. He formerly taught in Amarillo College, and was a graduate as-

sistant in Louisiana State University. He is now a lieutenant in a tank-destroyer division, and is aide-de-camp to the commanding general at Camp Hood, Texas.

Dallas C. Dickey: *Benjamin Morgan Palmer, Southern Divine* (A.B. Manchester; M.A. South Dakota; Ph.D. Louisiana) is Assistant Professor of Speech in Louisiana State University. His recently completed biography of the famous Whig orator of Mississippi, Seargent Smith Prentiss, is now in press.

Marie Hochmuth: *William Ellery Channing, New England Conversationalist* (A.B., M.A., Pittsburgh) is an Instructor of Speech in the University of Illinois.

F. L. Whan: *The Speech Profession Jilts Radio* (A.B., Kansas State; M.A., Illinois; Ph.D., Iowa), of the University of Wichita, is president of the Wichita Radio Council, Vice President of the Association for Education by Radio, and chairman of the committee assisting the Peabody Awards Committee. He is author of eleven published studies of state-wide radio surveys and contributed an article to the last issue of the JOURNAL on the speech training of airplane pilots.

Kenneth G. Hance: *Adapting "The Teaching Cycle" to Debate* (A.B., Olivet; Ph.D., Michigan), Associate Professor of Speech in the University of Michigan, is co-author (with James H. McBurney) of *The Principles and Methods of Discussion,* and is the author of articles in the field of public address.

J. W. Curvin: *Realism in Early American Art and Theatre* (A.B., M.A., Ph.D., Cornell) taught English and Public Speaking at Hobart and William Smith Colleges from 1934 to 1940 and taught dramatics in the summer school of Cornell, 1939-1942. Since 1941 he has been Assistant Professor of Speech and Drama, Chairman of the Department, and Director of the University Theatre in Vanderbilt University. In April, 1944, he was appointed lieutenant (jg)D-V (S), USNR.

Wendell Johnson: *The Indians Have No Word for It* (A.B., M.A., Ph.D., Iowa) is Associate Professor of Speech Pathology and Director of the Speech Clinic in the University of Iowa. He has published several research papers and monographs on stuttering and language behavior, and his recently completed book on the language aspects of personality adjustment is scheduled for publication. He is Editor of the *Journal of Speech Disorders,* which is published by the American Speech Correction Association.

Carl G. Gustavson: *A Talisman and a Convalescence* (A.B., Augustana; M.A., Illinois; Ph.D., Cornell) is Assistant Professor in Modern European History in Miami University.

Arleigh B. Williamson: *Diagnosis and Treatment of Eighty-Four Cases of Nasality* (A.B., Carnegie; M.A., Columbia) is Professor of Speech and Chairman of the Department in Washington Square College of Arts and Science, New York University, and Lecturer in the Jewish Theological Seminary of America. He is Past President of the Eastern Public Speaking Conference, and of the NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF TEACHERS OF SPEECH, and author of *Speaking in Public.* The present study is to be followed shortly by another on hoarse voice.

Charles W. Lomas: *Stage Fright* (A.B., Carroll; M.A., Ph.D., Northwestern) is at present a propaganda analyst with the Office of War Information in San Francisco. Last year he was Acting Assistant Professor of Speech in Stanford University, and from 1935-1943 was Instructor in Speech and Director of Debate in the University of Pittsburgh. He is author of a pamphlet on debate standards, a previous article on stage fright in the JOURNAL, and several articles on debate and discussion in *The Gavel.*

Franklin H. Knower: *What Is a Speech Test?* (A.B., Northwestern; Ph.D. Minnesota) is Associate Professor of Speech in the State University of Iowa. He has worked on a number of ASSOCIATION committees, and his articles on speech have appeared in this magazine, and in the journals of other educational and psychological organizations.